



Presented to the
LIBRARY *of the*
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
by

THE ESTATE OF THE LATE
MARY SINCLAIR





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

BOTH SIDES

OF THE

CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN THE

Roman and Reformed Churches : #

BEING

I. "A DOCTRINAL CATECHISM," ETC.,

"Approved by the Most Rev. John Hughes, etc."

AND

II. THE OTHER SIDE,

By the Rev. Thomas S. Bacon. D

"That it may please Thee to bring into the way of truth all such as have erred and are deceived : we beseech Thee to hear us, good Lord."

NEW YORK :
DELISSER & PROCTER,

SUCCESSORS TO STANFORD & SWORDS,

508 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

1859.



ENTERED, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1859,

By DELISSER & PROCTER,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for
the Southern District of New-York.

C O N T E N T S .

	PAGE
Rise and Progress of Protestantism,	13
The Protestant Reformation,	31
True Church of Christ,	50
The Rule of Faith,	88
Are the Scriptures the Rule of Faith?	108
On Communion,	139
Sacrifice of the Mass,	149
On Purgatory,	163
Justification,	174
On Indulgences,	186
The Head of the Church,	192
On the Assertion that the Pope is Antichrist,	207
On Councils,	209
On Obedience due to the Church,	216
On the Sacraments,	227
On Transubstantiation,	278
Penance and Confession,	289
Extreme Unction,	306
Holy Orders,	311
On Matrimony,	316
Ceremonies of the Church,	325
On Pictures and Images,	343
On Relics,	351
Pilgrimages,	355
The Virgin Mary,	357

	PAGE
On Persecution,	384
The Inquisition,	399
General Councils,	405
Reading the Scriptures,	409
Monks, Friars, and Nuns,	416
The Charge of Ignorance, etc.,	419
The Charge of Uncharitableness,	430
On Heresy,	435
Corruption of the Church foretold,	445
Protestant Rule of Faith examined,	450
On Infallibility, etc.,	483

TO THE

Rt. Rev. Wm. Henthcote De Lancey,
D.D., LL.D., D.C.L., Canon,

AS ONE WHO, BY ALL CONSENT, UNITES SO MANY OF THE QUALITIES WHICH BECOME
AND WHICH EXALT A BISHOP OF THE CHURCH OF GOD,

THIS BOOK IS INSCRIBED,

With the profound and grateful respects of

THE AUTHOR.



P R E F A C E .

THE author has prepared and published this book for the following reasons:

1st. Because a much loved and valued friend, (without whose help this work could not have been done,) being much concerned at the effect of the "Doctrinal Catechism," etc., herein contained, on some young persons, wished the other side presented and confronted with it, that a fair judgment between them might be made by any serious inquirer.

2d. Because he himself knew of no brief manual of this great controversy, presenting the whole matter in dispute in its modern aspect, and in the language of the present generation.

3d. That each of the two great parties might say all that it has to say, and in its own words—the advantage, if any, being on the side of those who usually refuse attention to the arguments of their opponents, upon the plea that their doctrine is misrepresented in the discussion.

4th. To confront the two parties so closely, that any who may be bewildered and misled by a partial view of the controversy, may see what is really in dispute.

5th. To appeal not merely to the intellect, as is usual, but also to the *conscience* of men, which is greatly concerned in this question, so that the reader may not only reject false religion, but heartily embrace the heavenly salvation of Christ our Lord.

6th. In all these ways to do good to the interesting people, whose especial "servant for Jesus' sake" he is, and who, at least, if no others, might, from personal knowledge of him and curiosity, give that attention to his writing which they might refuse to the more valuable labors of others.

For this end he has used freely all such writings as came in his way, and makes no special acknowledgments of them, just as he makes no claim of merit whatever for his own labor, meaning by this only in an humble way to "serve the Lord." He can, however, assure the reader of the entire accuracy of every citation and reference in it, which have been verified by him in the originals, almost all he refers to being those in the admirable collection of the Astor Library at New-York.

THOMAS S. BACON.

Natchitoches, La., 1858.



INTRODUCTION.

GOOD READER :

IN the year 1516, when, as some say, there was as yet no "Protestant religion," a famous writer of history, perhaps the greatest that has appeared among the Italians, said :* "Nor can any thing portend the ruin of our Church with more certainty than to see that the nearer people are to Rome, which is the capital of Christianity, the less devotion they have. He who should compare the present practice with the primitive foundation would see that utter destruction or some great judgment was hanging over our heads. By the scandalous example of the Court of Rome, Italy has lost every principle of piety and every sentiment of religion. This has been followed by many inconveniences and disorders ; for as the piety of a people is a mark that all is well with them, so, when they are wicked, it betokens the contrary. Thus, we Italians have this obligation to the Church and the priests, that by their means we have become impious and profligate." The same things, in substance had long been said by many eminent persons, including both clergymen and laymen,

* Machiavelli Disc. i. c. 12.

who still believed Rome to be the capital, and the Popes to be the chief rulers, of all Christians. This was just at the close of the Dark Ages.

There was then, at that time, without doubt, a great corruption of morals and spirit in the Church. Is it certain that there was not at the same time a great falling away from the pure and free *belief* in which the Lord and his Apostles had founded the Church? Is it certain that this evil living in the members and pastors of the Church did not come in part from false doctrine? Our Lord, you know, says: "Beware of false prophets, (teachers,) ye shall know them *by their fruits.*"

This is the great question which has been debated in the Christian world for the last three hundred and fifty years, and which is here presented on "both sides." On the one side, the Roman Church maintains that what was held by it and by those under its power in the Dark Ages, (and to this day,) is the genuine and pure Christian religion. On the other side, all other churches, and chiefly those called Protestant, maintain that the Roman Church has much that is false and dangerous mixed with "the faith once delivered to the saints," and that this false doctrine always has done harm, and always will, and therefore ought to be given up.

Those who defend the Roman Church often say that their doctrines are misunderstood and misstated in controversy by Protestants. Let them then speak for themselves fully word for word in an entire "Doctrinal

Catechism," lately published with the approval of their chief leader in this country. Thus, in these pages, that Church (which claims to have only one voice and doctrine every where) uses its own language and presents its chosen line of argument. The other side only follows this, and replies to each thing in turn in as few words. This gives the former every advantage in the discussion.

The question, however, often turns upon *a statement of fact*, in which one side affirms something to have taken place, and the other side denies it. In such a case, reader, either one or the other of them is perhaps trying to deceive, and is certainly in fact *misleading* you. Try to decide fairly which of them it is. Do this without prejudice; consider which one of us gives the best *proof* and shows the most candid love of the truth; and "set God always before you," for it is his message to men which is in question.

Whoever you are that are now reading these words, remember that this is a great controversy upon which *your* mind, and still more your *conscience*, are called to decide. It is no less than this: What is the real religion and salvation which God has given to men, to *you*, through his Son, Jesus Christ? Yes, it matters little or nothing to what *party* we belong in this world; or whether "our side" seems to prevail; if we shall find out *at last* that we have been *against the truth*, and especially if we lose our souls by pride and prejudice. The Roman Church maintains that this true religion is

exactly the same as was generally received in Europe three hundred and fifty years ago. We say that it had then been greatly disfigured and obscured by inventions of men, which gathered in the Church by degrees, and became enormous and dreadful in the Dark Ages. We believe that the Royal Lord of the Church, though he suffered it to fall into this sad weakness and darkness, which, like all his other providence, no man can fully explain ("O the depth!") was still "with" the Church, as He will be "to the end of the world." The Lord was with the Church still, to keep it from entirely perishing; to preserve the Holy Scriptures in which his gospel and the duty of the Church are plainly written, and to lead not a few of the members of the Church past the false doctrines which were mostly preached, to the true which, though written in the word of God, still lay generally neglected. Yet even these good men seldom noticed how contrary the ordinary preaching and worship were to the true doctrine of Christ in the Scriptures. At last the Lord put it into the hearts of some men to compare these things. They saw how the Church had gone away from the pure Gospel, and they devoted themselves to restoring the old ways; and so came about the great "Reformation."

Follow this argument now on "BOTH SIDES," and make up your own mind seriously; so that when you, being finally saved (or *lost*) forever, shall, with the vast assembly before our Lord in judgment, SEE ALL THINGS AS THEY REALLY ARE, you may be happy in thinking

that at this time you made a wise and honest decision. If you feel that you "lack wisdom," (as who of us does not for such a great choice?) "Ask of God and it shall be given you." (Jas. 1 : 5.) Above all, I pray God with all my heart that you and I may after that judgment go in together with the blessed of the Father into our Lord's heavenly kingdom. What say you?

Call upon Him then, in this prayer which I made every morning on beginning my labor upon this book :

"O Lord God, Heavenly Father, send, I pray, the Holy Ghost to enlighten my mind that I may have a sound and honest judgment in this inquiry into the true religion of thy Son, my Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, in whose most great and blessed name I ask this. Amen."

The serious and wise way of discussing these things would be to begin at once by proving that the doctrines of the Roman Church, which the Protestants oppose, are true, and that they have a good effect upon men—or the opposite. We may indeed suppose another way, namely, speaking of the personal behavior of some one who had much to do with the other side. As if on the one side they should begin by asking, "Who was Luther?" etc., or, on the other, "Who was Pope when the Reformation began?—Leo X. What sort of a man was he?—He was called a man of no piety (and even an Atheist) by some of the best men on his own side.*

* Fath. Paul., Hist. Council of Trent, i. § 4.

—What shall we think of a Church which had such a head and Holy Father? etc., etc.”

But this is not the fair and wise way to argue. Still as the “Doctrinal Catechism” has chosen to enter upon the discussion in this direction, we must follow it. Yet I ought to remind you to think well upon this: Why must we have first a personal attack upon Dr. Martin Luther? Does this look like the dignified and charitable candor which belongs to a serious love of truth? Are you a Roman Catholic? Then does not this look like attempting to approach you through your prejudices instead of by proof? Are you a Protestant? Then does your religious belief depend upon what sort of a man Luther was? Will you admit that? If we are to allow any weight at all to what is here said against Luther, it is vastly outweighed by what Machiavelli and many others said of the Church before the Reformation. *We might stop here, and say: “That at least is not the pure Church of Jesus Christ.”*

BOTH SIDES.

A DOCTRINAL CATECHISM; WHEREIN DIVERS POINTS OF CATHOLIC FAITH AND PRACTICE ASSAILED BY MODERN HERETICS ARE SUSTAINED BY AN APPEAL TO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, THE TESTIMONY OF THE ANCIENT FATHERS, AND THE DICTATES OF REASON. APPROVED OF BY THE MOST REV. JOHN HUGHES, D.D., ARCHBISHOP OF NEW-YORK.

The Rise and Progress of Protestantism, drawn from the Works of Luther himself.

CHAPTER I. — DOCT. CATECHISM.

QUESTION. What is Protestantism?

ANSWER. A new religion, invented and propagated by a man, named Martin Luther.

Q. In what year was Luther born?

A. In 1483.

Q. Where was he born?

A. In Eisleben, of Prussian Saxony.

Q. Of what religion were his parents?

A. They were Catholics, as were all his ancestors.

Q. At the time Luther was born, what was the religion of all Europe?

A. All believed what the Catholics believe at the present time.

Q. Was Luther himself a Catholic for any time?

A. He was a Catholic until his thirty-fifth year.

Q. What was his state of life ?

A. He was a monk of the order of discalced Augustinians.

Q. As such had he made religious vows ?

At the age of twenty-three years, he made vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience.

Q. Was he bound to keep these vows ?

A. Without doubt, since he made them after mature reflection, and of his own free will ; because the Prophet says, (Ps. 49,) "Pay thy vows to the Most High ;" and God himself says, (Num. 30 :) "If any man make a vow to the Lord, or bind himself by an oath, he shall not make his word void, but shall fulfill all that he promised."

Q. Did Luther obey this command of God by keeping his vows ?

A. No ; he violated all the three ; he apostatized—he married Catherine de Boré, a nun, like himself under vows, and he utterly disobeyed every ecclesiastical authority.

Q. Was this man in reality the founder of the Protestant religion, and the first of that sect that ever appeared in the world ?

A. Most certainly ; for no minister, no congregation, no body of Divines professing Protestant doctrines, was ever heard of until his time.

Q. What inference do you draw from all this ?

A. That Protestantism can not be the religion of Christ ; because, if the Church of Christ required reformation, a God of purity and holiness would never have chosen such an immoral character—an apostate, a wholesale vow-breaker, a sacrilegious seducer—for that purpose.

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What is Protestantism ?

A. There is no such "*religion*" at all. We Protestants are of the *Christian religion*. We are also *Catholics*, as belonging to the Catholic (or Universal) Church ; and we are called Protestants because we

protest against the corruptions brought into the most blessed truth of our Lord Jesus Christ during the Dark Ages, and mainly by the Roman Church.

Q. Who was Martin Luther?

A. A celebrated clergyman, the chief leader (*in Germany*) of the Reformation.

Q. What was the state of religion in Europe in the early part of Luther's life?

A. This was just at the close of the Dark Ages. All Europe was Christian, at least in name; and it was then believed by all* that the Church of Rome had lawful power over all Christians. Its doctrines were received by all; and indeed, no one was suffered to speak against them under pain of imprisonment, or even death.

Q. What was Luther's calling?

A. Being a serious, and as well as he knew how, a pious young man, he had become a priest (or presbyter) in the Church; and, thinking this his duty, had also joined an order of monks.

Q. As such had he made "religious vows"?

A. Yes: these monks, on entering their various "orders," make what are called "vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience."

Q. Was he bound to keep these vows when he afterwards came to think that no one ought to make or keep them?

A. No: since this would have been to act against his belief and conscience. It is certainly possible, blindly to make a "vow" which, when we become enlightened we ought to break, (especially when we thus harm no other man's person or goods;) as a pagan who should in his religion vow to kill some one, and should be converted before he had done this. St. Paul says this in spirit, of one of the very things of which the monks make "religious vows." (See 1 Cor. 7 : 9.) On the other hand, *it is no where written* in the word

* There had been some in almost, if not quite every generation, who protested against this. Some were celebrated men, like Wickliffe, John Huss, and Savonarola. But all such were cruelly persecuted, even to death, by the Popes and their supporters. In Luther's time no one dared to say such things openly.

of God, that Christians are to keep every "vow" that may pass their lips; when they afterwards find that they made it under a mistaken sense of duty. Observe that the Doctrinal Catechism can find nothing in the *New Testament* which even *sounds* like this opinion. So it quotes what, at the utmost, referred to the Old Law of Moses, and even then did not mean every ill-advised profession that any man might make.

Besides, in *becoming Christians* we vow every thing that virtue and piety require, and God can but be displeased with our professing any thing *beyond this*; especially if we thus fix ourselves in unnatural conditions, (like that of a forced single life,) which all experience has shown to be usually the cause of dreadful wickedness.

Q. Did Luther then break any command of God in afterwards leaving his "vows" as a monk?

A. No: for all he did was innocent and proper. He married a virtuous woman, (who was no more bound by unnatural vows than he was,) and, "Marriage is honorable in all,"* and he maintained the pure and free service of our Lord in the Church, against traitors and tyrants who misled and misgoverned it.

Q. Was he, then, the founder of a new religion?

A. No: for what he taught is the pure Christian religion, as found in the Holy Scriptures, and alone taught in the Church by the Apostles and first Christians, and which was even then, in the main, *professed by the Roman Church itself*. The difference was, that he opposed many dreadful false doctrines which had been *added to the Gospel*, and which were made the most of in those days; so that the Roman Church would not allow that any one was a Christian who denied them; no, nor, when they had the power, even suffer him to live.

Q. What, on the whole, was the character of Luther?

A. He was a man of great warmth of heart, which sometimes made him speak and write bitterly; but his private life was blameless and devout, as all the great historians on both the Roman and Reformed sides

* Heb. 13 : 4 : so the Douay Bible.

agree. Fleury, (a priest of the Roman Church, and confessor of the King of France,) says, in his famous Ecclesiastical History: "I shall not stop to enlarge upon the calumnies which some Catholic authors, too ultra, have charged against him, and in which they have paid little regard to probability. We do not propose to adopt them." "All that can be said against Luther is, that he rose up against the Church, etc."*

Peter Bayle, a most learned and cool critic, who was on neither side, says: "I shall chiefly insist on the many falsehoods which have been published respecting Luther. No regard has been paid in this point to the rules of the art of slandering. And yet the authors of these have assumed all the confidence of those who fully believe that the public will implicitly espouse their stories, be they ever so absurd."†

Philip Melancthon, who knew him well, and whom all admit to have been an amiable and virtuous man, says: "This revival of most excellent doctrine procured him a great and extensive authority, especially as the life of the man harmonized with his speech, which was seen to come not merely from the lips, but from the heart. This admiration of his life verified that saying of the ancients: 'The pious conduct of a man maketh his speech persuasive.' Wherefore some excellent characters more readily complied with the plans which he afterwards proposed of changing certain established ceremonies."‡

Lastly, the famous scholar *Erasmus*, of whose fame the Church of Rome is very proud, and who knew Luther well, says, in a letter to Cardinal Campegius, that: "In proportion as any person was remarkable for upright morals and gospel purity, he had the less objection to Luther's sentiments. Besides, the *life of the man is extolled even by those who can not bear his doctrines.*"§

You see the truth about Luther! and you remember what the Doctrinal Catechism said of him. What

* Hist. Tom. xxv. 502, 503.

† Hist. and Crit. Dict., Art. *Luther*.

‡ Pref. to 2d vol. *Luther's Works* by Melancthon.

§ Op. *Erasm.* ii.

confidence can you, then, put in the statements of one who thus misleads you, whether from malice or ignorance? A falsehood can be told in a line which it takes pages to disprove. I shall often after this, have occasion to tell you that the Doctrinal Catechism says what is not true, when I can not stop to give all the proof of this. But I pledge my honor and my *careful inquiry* for the truth of all I say; and you see by the above what my adversary's word is worth.

CHAP. II.—DOCT. CATECHISM.

Q. What induced Luther to attack the ancient Catholic faith, and invent a new creed?

A. Pride and jealousy. Pope Leo having granted an Indulgence, Luther's pride was mortified, because the commission to preach that Indulgence was given to the order of St. Dominic, and not to his own.

Q. To what did he allow himself to be driven by this pride and jealousy?

A. To attack the doctrine of Indulgences itself.

Q. Would the Catholic Church have blamed Luther had he merely attacked the abuses or avarice of individual Catholics?

A. No, certainly. He erred in this, that under pretense of reprehending abuses, he assailed the true faith on the subject of Indulgences.

Q. What was his next step?

A. He posted on the gates of the Church of Wittemburg, ninety-five articles, which he wrote, and which contained many things not in accordance with the doctrines of the Church.

Q. Were these articles refuted?

A. They were, and with much ability, by some Catholic Theologians, to whom Luther replied with a haughty insolence unworthy of a Christian.

Q. What hypocritical pretenses did Luther make in 1517, during these disputes?

A. He pretended that he wished to teach nothing but what was conformable to Scripture, to the Holy

Fathers, and approved by the Holy See. (T. 1. Ger. Edit. Gen. p. 12.)

Q. What did he write to Jerome, Bishop of Brandenburg?

A. That he wished to decide nothing himself, and that he wished to submit all his doctrines to the Church. (Ibid. p. 54.)

Q. What did he write to Pope Leo in 1518?

A. That he would listen to that Pope's decision as to an oracle proceeding from the mouth of Jesus Christ. (Ibid. p. 58.)

Q. What did he promise to his religious superiors?

A. That he would be silent, if his adversaries were placed under the same restraint.

Q. What inference do you draw from all this?

A. That he was either a hypocrite who did not intend to fulfill his promises, or that he was quite satisfied of the truth of the doctrines which he impugned, since otherwise he could not conscientiously promise silence and obedience.

Q. What other consequences do you draw?

A. That a man swollen with pride, envy, jealousy—a disobedient hypocrite—was not the person to be chosen by God to reform abuses if any such existed.

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What induced Luther to oppose the prevailing opinions in religion?

A. A serious belief that they were dangerously wrong. His attention was first drawn to this, and his indignation aroused by the shameful practices of certain priests who sold "Indulgences," as they were called, from the Pope. This led him to examine the doctrine from which this conduct came, and which he found to be far from the pure old Christian truth.* So Erasmus says: "Good men lament and weep for these things, and even divines who are not monks acknowledge the truth of them, as also some of the monks in their private

* Hist. of the Council of Trent by Father Paul Sarpi, i. 16.

conversations. These things I believe first put Luther upon the dangerous work of opposing some of the most intolerable and shameless abuses. *For what can we think otherwise of a person who neither aims at worldly honor nor riches ?*"* Even a Pope, Adrian VI., six years after Luther's first preaching the Reformation, confessed to the Princes of Germany, that: "This confusion arose from the sins of men, and *especially from those of the ecclesiastics and prelates*"—that for some years abominations had been committed by the HOLY SEE; that there were many abuses in the administration of spiritual things, and *excess in precepts*; that finally all was perverted, so that the corruption had passed from Head to members, and from the SOVEREIGN PONTIFFS to the inferior prelates, and that *there was hardly one who did good.*"†

Q. What was this doctrine of "Indulgences" which Luther first attacked?

A. That the Pope can, whenever he chooses, "unlock that sacred treasure composed of the merits, sufferings, and virtues of Christ our Lord, and of his Virgin Mother, and of all the saints," etc.; and "mercifully give and grant in the Lord a plenary indulgence, remission, and pardon of all their sins to all the faithful of Christ."‡ In practice any member of that Church can procure one of these "Indulgences" when he chooses, by paying a small fee. Pope Leo X. issued these "Indulgences" in the year 1517, giving the sale of them to different persons, they to pay him a certain part of the profits, with which he might finish building the Church of St. Peter, at Rome. Thus, a vicious and impudent monk, named John Tetzel, went through Germany, offering to all men the pardon of any sins, (even those they were *yet to commit*,) however great, to be paid for by buying these Indulgences. I do not wonder that this shocked Luther and others.§

Q. Do the defenders of the Roman Church admit this to be a true statement of their doctrine of Indulgences?

A. In disputing with Protestants they usually declare

* Op. Erasm. ii.

† Bull of Leo XII. 1825. Bull. Rom. XVI.

‡ Fath. Paul i.

§ Seckendorf, i.

this to be a false charge against them, though we have here the very words of a Pope! This shows that either such persons are very ignorant of their own Church or very dishonest. Otherwise the Roman Church has *not* always and every where "*one faith*"; but says one thing at one time and place, and the opposite at another.

Q. Were Luther's writings replied to?

A. They were, and chiefly by violent threats. His opposers sought to bring down all the power of the Church upon him. All this time he wished to maintain his opinions within the Church as it then was, and with the approval of its chief pastors. He offered to submit all to the Pope, or to a General Council. This seems the natural conduct of a man who was groping his way out of a wrong education.

Q. Did he oppose only the doctrine of "Indulgences"?

A. He soon found by his study of the Holy Scriptures, that this was only a small part of the false doctrine which prevailed, and he boldly followed his conscience and reason in exposing it all.

CHAP. III.—DOCT. CATECHISM.

Q. What took place at Augsburg between Luther and Cardinal Cajetan?

A. The Cardinal required of him, that he should retract his errors, which Luther refused, appealing at the same time to the most celebrated Universities of Germany, and to that of Paris, and pledging himself most humbly to submit to their decision. (Ibid. p. 119 and p. 14.)

Q. Did he stand by that appeal?

A. No; he appealed a short time after to the Pope. (Ibid. p. 122.)

Q. Did he abide by this second appeal?

A. No, he next appealed "from the Pope ill-informed," "to the Pope well-informed." (Ibid. p. 205.)

Q. Did he stop even here?

A. No; he then appealed to a General Council. (Ibid. p. 351.)

Q. Did he abide by this resolution to submit to the decision of a General Council?

A. No; at the Diet of Worms, he declared flatly that he would not submit his doctrine to any Council. (Ibid. pp. 448, 450, 452.)

Q. What do you conclude from such conduct?

A. In the *first* place, that Luther must have been extremely fickle to appeal to so many judges, and to abide by the decision of none. *Secondly*, that he knew his cause was bad and his doctrine false, since he would not submit it even to the best judges. *Thirdly*, that he must have been brimful of sinful pride and obstinacy, since he preferred his own single judgment to that of the whole Christian world.

Q. But did not Luther promise to abandon his errors, if any one would prove them such from Scripture?

A. Yes; but this was only an artifice to enable him more freely to propagate them; because he well knew that the Scriptures may be wrested into any, or every meaning; that he could give them any sense he pleased, as the Mormons, the Millerites, and other strange sects do at the present day: the Scripture is made to teach all sorts of contradictions.

Q. What was his real object in this subterfuge?

A. He wished to impose his monstrous errors on the public, as truths bearing the sacred stamp of Scriptural authority. Had he been sincere in his appeal, he would have said: I shall leave it to the Church to decide whether my doctrine is conformable to the Scripture or not.

CHAP. III.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What took place then?

A. Luther still maintained his opinions against all his powerful opposers in writing and also in speech, before the great assemblies of the German Empire at Worms,

and at Augsburg even when the Emperor and great lords were pledged to the Pope to destroy him if he did not give way. Many generous minds have been struck with admiration at the sight of such bravery in a solitary man in behalf of what he thought the cause of God and the liberation of his fellow-men from tyranny and false religion.

Q. Did he make appeals from his enemies, first to the Universities, then to the Pope, then to a General Council, and lastly to the Holy Scriptures?

A. Yes: just as any man who thought himself clearly in the right would feel sure of being sustained by any just and lawful judge.

CHAP. IV.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What judgment did the Universities, to which Luther appealed, pronounce upon his doctrine?

A. They condemned his doctrine as false and heretical. (Ibid. p. 539.)

Q. What Universities did so?

A. The Universities of Leipsic, Cologne, Louvain, and Paris.

Q. Did Luther abide by their decision as he had promised?

A. No; on the contrary, he poured forth a torrent of invectives and insults against them; he called the University of Paris "the mother of errors," "the daughter of Antichrist," "the gate of hell." (Ibid. p. 548.)

Q. What was the judgment of the Pope to whom Luther appealed, and whose decisions he promised to receive, as if they came from the mouth of Christ himself?

A. The Pope published a Bull, condemning forty-one articles of Luther's doctrine.

Q. What does the Pope say in that Bull?

A. That he had done every thing he could to reclaim Luther, but that all his paternal cares and advices had been unavailing. He gives Luther sixty days to retract, and orders his works to be formally burned at the end of that period, should he persist in his errors.

Q. Did Luther submit?

A. No ; he now renounces the authority to which he had appealed ; he writes against the Bull of his chief Superior, whom he had vowed to obey ; he denounces the Papal decision as the decision of Antichrist, (Ibid. p. 345 ;) he publicly burns the Bull along with the book of Decretals. (Ibid. p. 353.)

Q. Had Luther previously written, in the most submissive terms, declaring that he was willing to cast himself at the feet of his Holiness?

A. Yes, (Ibid. p. 58 ;) but the moment the Pope opposed him, he changed his language, declaring that not only the Bull, but the Pope himself should be burned. (Ibid. p. 553.)

Q. Had Luther not written, a little before, that his preservation or destruction depended entirely on the absolution or condemnation of his Holiness? (Ibid. p. 53.)

A. Yes ; but he now declares that men must take up arms against the Pope, the Cardinals, and Bishops, and wash their hands in the blood of these dignitaries. (Ibid. p. 60.)

Q. Had he not written, before this time, that the Pope and the Catholic Church were the highest spiritual authority on earth? (Ibid. p. 144.)

A. Yes ; but he now teaches, that none but those who oppose the Papal authority can be saved. (Ibid. p. 553.)

Q. What do you now think of Luther's conduct?

A. I can discover nothing in it but the spirit of inconstancy, doubt, error, and revenge, without even the slightest mark of the spirit of God.

CHAP. IV.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Why did Luther change his appeals?

A. Because (1) it was plain that the professors in the Universities were but men who might err as well as he ; and he saw by their decisions that they were determined to uphold the false doctrines of the Dark Ages,

against the plain sense of the Holy Scriptures. (2) Then, as he studied further in the word of God, he saw that the Pope had no such lawful authority as he had before believed, and in fact did decide against the plain written words of God. (3) He had also reason to believe that such a "General Council," as might be called, would only repeat what the Pope dictated. So he fell back upon what (as all admit) could not be wrong, the Holy Scriptures. It was noble thus to stand up to his conscience when all Europe was against him and no one came to his help. According to the reasoning of the Doctrinal Catechism, the holy martyrs of the primitive Church must have been "brimful of sinful pride and obstinacy" in preferring their opinions to those of the Pagan world around them.

Q. Is it strange that in this desperate and single-handed stand against such dreadful enemies, Luther sometimes wrote very bitterly, and even savagely?

A. No: for a furious and dangerous conflict tempts a brave man to be passionate. So we see the good Luther, as he himself confessed,* sometimes falling into this fault.

CHAP. V.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What did the secular power do to suppress the rising heresy?

A. The Emperor, Charles V., cited Luther to appear before the Diet of Worms, and sought to reclaim him by the mildest means.

Q. What reply did Luther make to the order of the Emperor?

A. He replied, that from the wording of the order, one would suppose the Emperor to be either a maniac or a demoniac. (Ibid. p. 460.)

Q. Why was not Luther confined, to prevent him from corrupting others, and from exciting disturbance?

A. He had received the assurance of a safe conduct, and the civil authorities could not break their promise.

* Milner's Ch. Hist. ii. 526.

When, however, the term of the safe conduct had expired, the Emperor proscribed Luther as a sectarian, cut off from the body of the Church.

Q. Whither did Luther then retire ?

A. To the castle of Wirtemberg, where he wrote the most false and pernicious works.

Q. What was the effect of these works, in which he spoke of nothing but "*evangelical liberty*" ?

A. These works produced disturbances, sedition, and amongst other evils, the German War of the Peasants, who committed every sort of excess, declaring that the rich had no exclusive right to their property, that every thing should be held in common, because in the 2d chapter of the Acts, it is said, that all property was common amongst the first Christians.

Q. Did other divisions and schisms soon appear amongst the Lutherans ?

A. Yes ; each disciple of Luther thought he had as good a right as his master to expound the Scripture according to his own peculiar whim ; Carlostad, Zwinglius, Calvin, Muncer, Schwenckfeld, were of this opinion. They interpreted for themselves, denounced their master, and set up religions of their own.

Q. Did the thing called "*religion*," invented by Luther, continue thus to give rise to new and different sects ?

A. Yes ; every year gave rise to a new spawn of sectarians—a short period produced *thirty-four* different sects ; and even to this day, the religion of Luther is as prolific of sects and sectarians, as the putrid carcass is of insects or vermin. So true is it, that when we once abandon truth, there can be no end to our wanderings in the mazes of error ; that when we once break the moorings which bind us to the rock of truth, by the adoption of a false principle, such as that of private interpretation, we are only the prey of endless, ever-varying, erroneous *human* opinions, tossed to and fro on a wide ocean of contradictions and contrarieties, to-day on one tack, to-morrow upon another, certain of nothing but ultimate shipwreck on the rock of infidelity or the quicksands of heresy and schism.

Q. What lesson do you learn from this portion of Luther's conduct?

A. That the man who wantonly disobeys all authority, both ecclesiastical and civil—the man who perverts the sacred Scripture, for the purpose of exciting sedition and anarchy, and propagating evident heresy and schism—can not possibly be the ambassador of heaven.

CHAP. V.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What were the "mild means" of which the "Doctrinal Catechism" speaks, used to reclaim Luther?

A. The powerful and terrible Emperor, Charles V., summoned him before the Diet (or congress) of Germany with a "safe conduct," (or promise that he should come and go safely,) and then tried to coax or terrify him into submission to the Pope. But he remained firm. Then, as soon as he had gone away under the protection of his "safe conduct," the Emperor issued decrees against him, full of dreadful and bitter words, such as these: "As it appears that the aforesaid Martin Luther is not a man, but Satan under the form of a man, and clothed in the dress of a priest the better to bring the human race to hell and damnation; therefore, he and all his disciples are to be punished with death and forfeiture of all their goods."*

Q. What then was Luther's "retiring" (as the Doc. Cat. has it) into the castle of Wartburg, (not Wirtemberg)?

A. A friend had him secretly stopped on his road, and shut up in this lonely fortress to save him from the Emperor.

Q. Had the Emperor even thought of violating the safe conduct and seizing Luther at Worms, though by this he would have broken his oath?

A. The ambassador of the Pope, and others, urged him to do so; but it seemed to him too infamous, and he replied that he "would not like to blush like Sigismund."

* Brandt, i. 40. Luth. Opp. xvii. 598.

In this, he alluded to the treachery of that Emperor toward John Huss, (a noble reformer a hundred years before,) committed at the entreaty of the Council of Constance. When the Council condemned Huss to be burned to death, he spoke of his "safe conduct," and looked at the Emperor, who blushed deeply, but said nothing. Many years after, Charles (when he had become more pious than ever, in his way) regretted that he had not seized Luther at this time.*

Q. Did Luther's doctrines have any political effect?

A. Perhaps they assisted by the spirit of liberty, which true religion gives to the soul of man, in rousing the oppressed peasants of Germany to their revolt against the princes at this time. In this war these ignorant people said and did violent things for which we may well believe that their oppressors were as much to blame as they.

Q. Did the Reformed doctrine extend in spite of persecution?

A. Yes, rapidly. In less than forty years it prevailed in almost all the North of Europe.

Q. Did all who thus freed themselves from the tyranny and false doctrine of the Roman Church, agree together in their belief?

A. There was a wonderful agreement among them in all the chief matters of Christian doctrine. Yet in using their right of free judgment upon Holy Scripture, they did not accord in some things of less importance. It is very coarsely said by the Doctrinal Catechism, that "every year gave rise to a new spawn of sectarians, a short period produced thirty-four different sects, and even to this day, the religion of Luther is as prolific of sects and sectarians as the putrid carcass is of insects or vermin." If this be so, there ought to have been more such sects in thirty years than there were Christians of every name in the world! Whereas, almost all the Protestants at this day may be reckoned generally under five or six different names; and these could exchange their creeds without any very serious difference.

* Sterling's Cloist. Life of Charles V., c. ix. 261.

CHAP. VI.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What means did Luther resort to for the purpose of supplying his new church with priests, seeing that no bishop could or would ordain any of his followers?

A. He invented a new doctrine on that subject, a doctrine never known in the Church till his time.

Q. What was that doctrine?

A. That all Christians—men, women, and children, even infants—were truly and really priests, and that nothing was wanting to them but presentation to a cure. (Ibid. pp. 64, 336, 369.)

Q. Upon what did he found this unheard-of doctrine?

A. Upon that passage of St. Peter, “You are a *royal* priesthood.” “St. Peter,” he reasoned, “addresses this to all Christians, therefore all Christians are priests.” He might equally well have proved, from the same passage, that all Christians are kings; since St. Peter declares that they are all ROYAL. Hence, as all Christians are confessedly not kings, so neither are they all priests. Hence, again, all the followers of Luther should be satisfied, that their pretended pastors are only wolves in sheep’s clothing, who entered the fold not by the door but over the wall, since their pretended orders and mission are founded only upon a passage of Scripture evidently perverted to suit a purpose.

Q. What was Luther’s next step after abolishing the true priesthood amongst his followers?

A. He next abolished the true Sacrifice.

Q. What did he allege against the sacrifice of the Mass?

A. Various things, which he learned from the devil, as he himself declares.

Q. How does he express himself on that subject in his book on the Mass? (Tom. vi. p. 82.)

A. “Having awoke,” he says, “about midnight, the devil commenced a dispute with me on the subject of the Mass.”

Q. What did the devil say to him ?

A. "Listen, most sapient Doctor," *said the father of lies* : "during fifteen years you have said Mass almost every day. What if all these acts have been only so many acts of idolatry ?"

Q. Did Luther hearken to the paternal advice of his sable director ?

A. He listened so well, that he allowed himself to be persuaded that the devil was right and he wrong, so that the enemy of man came off victor ; and though Luther in the same book calls the devil the most artful and lying deceiver, he here chose to follow his advice rather than that of the Church.

Q. What think you of all this ?

A. One can hardly tell at which to be most astonished ; at the open and brazen avowal of Luther, or at the awful blindness of those who follow a master, who, by his own account, received his training and instruction in the school of Satan.

CHAP. VI.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. How was the succession of ministers of Christ continued in the Reformed Churches ?

A. In some, as in the Church of England, in the old way, by the ordinations of the *bishops*, most of whom joined in the Reformation ; in others, as in the churches of Germany, where the bishops remained in the false doctrine, by presbyters (or priests) ordaining. It was certainly better thus to deviate from those *forms* of the Church which the Apostles established, than to continue in a corruption of that TRUTH OF GOD which those blessed men taught—that corruption of this truth which had come over the Church in the Dark Ages.

Q. Did the Reformers explain what is said in the word of God to all believers, "Ye are a royal priesthood," any otherwise than it had been understood in the Church from the time of the Apostles ?

A. No ; and he who gives it any other sense, sets himself against the ancient Church.*

Q. Did the Reformers "abolish the true sacrifice" of the Mass?

A. There is no such sacrifice in the Christian religion : the notion of it arose long after the Apostles, from a serious mistake (as we shall see by and by) in regard to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. It was therefore necessary to correct this error, as was done by the Reformers.

Q. What do you think of Luther's obtaining his arguments against the Mass from the devil?

A. I think that to understand his powerful figures in that way is very silly, though it is much easier than to refute his arguments.



*The Protestant Pretended Reformation is not the
Work of God.*

CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Can any one reasonably believe that the change in religion brought about by Luther is the work of God?

A. No one can believe it, unless he be utterly ignorant of the true nature of religion, and very unlearned in matters of history.

Q. Why do you make this answer?

A. Because, in the first place, the author of the Reformation is not a man of God ; secondly, because his work is not the work of God ; thirdly, because the means which he used in effecting his purpose are not of God.

Q. Why do you say Luther is not a man of God ?

A. Because he has left us in his works abundant proof, that if God saw need for any reformation in his Church, such a man as Luther would not be selected to carry God's will into effect.

* Just. Mart. adv. Trypho. 344, etc.

Q. What have you to blame in Luther's works?

A. They are full of indecencies very offensive to modesty, crammed with a low buffoonery well calculated to bring religion into contempt, and interlarded with very many gross insults, offered in a spirit very far from Christian charity and humility, to individuals of dignity and worth.

Q. Passing over his indecencies in silence, give us a specimen of his buffooneries and insults. What does he say to the King of England, replying to a book which the king had written against him? (Tom. ii. p. 145.)

A. He calls the king "an ass," "an idiot," "a fool," "whom very infants ought to mock."

Q. How does he treat Cardinal Albert, Archbishop and Elector of Mayence, in the work which he wrote against the Bishop of Magdeburg? (Tom. vii. p. 353.)

A. He calls him "an unfortunate little priest, crammed with an infinite number of devils."

Q. What does he say of Henry Duke of Brunswick? (Tom. vii. p. 118.)

A. That he had "swallowed so many devils in eating and drinking, that he could not even spit any thing but a devil." He calls Duke George of Saxony, "a man of straw, who, with his immense belly, seemed to bid defiance to heaven, and to have swallowed up Jesus Christ himself." (Tom. ii. p. 90.)

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Was Dr. Luther the author of the Reformation?

A. In no such sense that its truth depended upon his being without fault. The same doctrine, in the main, had been held by some (and witnessed to with heroic martyrdom) *in every age since the false doctrines had prevailed*. Among such early "Protestants," were Paulinus, Bishop of Aquileia, (in the eighth century;) Claudius, Bishop of Turin, (in the ninth century;) Dr. John Wickliffe, in England; the holy and reverend John Huss, and Jerome of Prague, in Bohemia, who were

murderously burned to death for this a hundred years before the Reformation, suffering with the sweetest meekness and most firm and fearless trust in our Lord.

Yet Luther had the honor of making the first *successful* stand against these errors. As soon as his powerful voice rung through Europe, other men, nearly if not quite his equals in piety and courage, and some even his superiors in wisdom, arose in different countries, to assist in the reformation of the Church. England was never even visited by Luther, yet in that country the Church was brought back to the belief and worship of the first Christians even more successfully than any where else. This was done under the lead of some holy bishops, who were afterward, like Huss and Jerome, burned to death, when the Roman Church regained power in England for a few years.

Q. Was Luther only one of those bad men whom God sometimes uses to do great good?

A. It would be very wrong to think so of him. He was plainly a virtuous and high-minded man; but, above all, inflamed with a love for the truth and the glory of God. We ought most devoutly to thank our Lord, that when he gave Dr. Luther this great charge, to lead the way in the Reformation, he also armed him with the ardor, firmness, and courage to do his duty.

Q. What do his enemies with truth object to him?

A. Some coarse and bitter expressions in his numerous and hasty writings. His coarseness was the bad fashion of the times, (you will find it in the works of that great and pure soul, the poet Shakspeare, as well as in *all* the religious writings of that day.) The fierceness of some of his words to his enemies is to be regretted; but we must generously remember, for one who has done us all such great service, that he was set upon almost alone by a host of savage assailants and blood-thirsty persecutors. (See p. 27.)

CHAP. II.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Was Luther's language more respectful, when he addressed the Emperor and the Pope?

A. No; he treated them both with equal indignities; he said that the Grand Turk had ten times the virtue and good sense of the Emperor—that the Pope was “a wild beast,” “a ravenous wolf, against whom all Europe should rise in arms.”

Q. What do you conclude from Luther's insolent, outrageous, and libertine manner of speaking?

A. That he was not the man to be chosen by God to reform his Church; for his language is the strongest proof that he was actuated, not by the spirit of God, but by the spirit of the devil.

Q. May not his party say, that they care little about the manner of the man, if his doctrine be true—that it is not upon him, but upon the word of God, they build their faith?

A. If the Protestant doctrine be true, then God used Luther as a chosen instrument to reëstablish his true faith; but no reasonable man can possibly believe the latter; therefore, neither can any reasonable man believe that the Protestant is the true faith.

Q. May it not be objected that there were individual pastors in the Catholic Church as worthless as Luther?

Yes; but all the pastors of the Catholic Church were not so at one and the same time, whilst Luther, at the time we speak of was the first and only teacher of Protestantism. Besides, Christ himself gives an unanswerable reply to the objection, (Matt. 23 :) “The Scribes and Pharisees have sitten in the chair of Moses; all things therefore whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do, but according to their works do ye not.” Again, some Catholic pastors may have been bad men, but still they were the lawful ministers of God, having succeeded to lawfully commissioned predecessors; but Luther stood alone; he succeeded to none having lawful authority from whom he could derive a mission. In fine, whatever may have been the

lives of some vicious Catholic pastors, they taught nothing new, their teaching was the same as that of the best and holiest ministers of the Church. Hence, there was no innovation in matters of faith, or principles of morality. But Luther was the first to teach a new doctrine, unknown in the world before his time.

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What shall we say of Luther's language to the Emperor and the Pope?

A. If such language is ever proper, it was not amiss in this case: for Charles V. *was* a tyrant,* and the power of the Popes was the curse of Europe, as was seen most plainly then by their attempt to put down free inquiry and Reformation in the Church.

Q. Who were the chief opposers of the Reformation?

A. Besides the Popes, the other most powerful monarchs of Europe: in Germany and Spain, Charles V. and Philip II.; in France, Francis I., Charles IX., and Henry II. and III.; in England, Henry VIII.† and Mary. Every one of these was not only a bloody tyrant, but also, (except the last,) while very religious according to the Roman Church, indecent and filthy in their private life and moral conduct.

Q. While the faults of any particular Protestant can not prove the Reformed doctrine to be wrong, is this as true of the Roman Church?

A. No: for that Church claims that it, in its outward form, its priesthood, and especially its chief bishops—and *it alone*—is that Church with which Our Lord 'will be to the end of the world.' Now, holiness of life is as necessary to Christians and to the

* See p. 27 for his language toward Luther himself.

† It is a strange mistake, which many persons make, of calling this king a "Protestant," because he opposed the power of the Pope; when in all other things he upheld the false doctrines of the Roman Church to the day of his death, wrote against Luther, and had men burned to death for speaking against the "sacrifice of the Mass."

honor of the Church as correct belief. Therefore the one person who represents the "infallibility" of the Church, (if there must be this infallibility,) should, by the almighty power of the Lord, be as safely kept in *holiness* as in *sound doctrine*. That Church has, indeed, allowed this, by entitling the Pope "HIS HOLINESS." Yet, many of the Popes have been notoriously wicked men. Therefore the Church in which *such men* are the "visible centres of unity," (as they say,) can not be THE *holy Church of Christ*. God has made this clear in his Providence; for instance, making it come to pass that, just before the Reformation, after there had been very wicked Popes for forty years, there should be one at last, who is by all consent, the most infamous wretch in human history, HIS HOLINESS, POPE ALEXANDER VI.*

CHAP. III.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. We are now satisfied that the author of Protestantism was not a man of God; show us that his undertaking was not from God—what did he undertake?

A. He undertook to show that the Church had fallen into error, separated himself from her, and formed his followers into a party against her

Q. Could such an undertaking be from God?

A. No; for God has commanded us not to sit in judgment upon the Church, but to hear and obey her with respect; "and if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican." (Matt. chap. 18.)

Q. Was it the particular "territorial" Church of the Roman States, or the Universal Catholic Church, that Luther charged with having erred?

A. It was the Universal Church he dared to calumniate in this manner.

* See Michelet, Hist. de la Ren. p. 213, etc., etc.

Q. How do you prove this?

A. Before the time of Luther, there was no Christian society in the whole world which believed the doctrines afterwards taught by Luther; consequently, he assailed not any particular sect or church, but the faith of the whole Christian world.

Q. Are you quite sure, that it is incontestably true, that no Christian body ever believed, before Luther's time, the new doctrines he began then to propagate?

A. So sure, that we have Luther's own authority for it. His words are, (Tom. ii. p. 9, b. :) "How often has not my conscience been alarmed? How often have I not said to myself: *Dost thou ALONE of all men pretend to be wise? Dost thou pretend that ALL CHRISTIANS have been in error, during such a long period of years?*"

Q. What was it that gave Luther most pain, during the time he meditated the introduction of his new religion?

A. A hidden respect for the authority of the Church, which he found it impossible to stifle.

Q. How does he express himself on this matter? (Tom. ii. p. 5.)

A. "After having subdued all other considerations, it was with the utmost difficulty I could eradicate from my heart the feeling that I *should obey the Church.*" "I am not so presumptuous," said he, "as to believe, that it is in God's name I have commenced and carried on this affair; I should not wish to go to judgment, *resting on the fact* that God is my guide in these matters." (Tom. i. p. 364, b.)

CHAP. III.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Has God commanded us to take our religious belief entirely from the Church, and not to dispute any thing which its pastors teach?

A. There is no such command in the Holy Scriptures, but we *are* commanded in them to "prove all things" for ourselves, and to "search the Scriptures."

Q. What is the Church?

A. It is the society of the people of God, which in this world maintains his worship, and the preaching of the Gospel, and cultivates goodness in its members. Wherever we find this done, we may be sure of having found a part of the Church. It was established by Jesus Christ Our Lord himself, and is kept up by his providence and spiritual presence in the world.

Q. Should we pay no respect to the teaching of the Church?

A. God forbid! It teaches with a rightful authority in various ways: 1st, (and best of all,) *by giving us the written word of God*. This is pure and certain truth, "infallible" beyond all doubt; and we should hear or read it diligently, reverently, and obediently. We should also listen in the same spirit to the lessons *taken from the Book of God* by the bishops and other ministers, and given to us in sermons, and other like instructions. Where the meaning of the Holy Book seems to us doubtful, we should pay great respect to that interpretation of it which, so far as we can learn, has prevailed in the Church in its best days. We ought still more to yield to the judgment of the Church in those matters about which Our Lord gave no positive commands in his Word, but left them mainly to its judgment, such as the form of government and worship.

Q. But some quote Him as saying in regard to all doctrine: "Hear the Church"?

A. The *only place* where these words are found in Scripture is this passage: "Moreover, if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to *hear the Church*, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican."*

* Matt. 18 : 15-17. The translation allowed by the Roman Church does not differ in meaning from this, as you will see here: "But if thy brother shall offend against thee, go and rebuke him between thee and

Our Lord directing how one member of the Church ought to act toward another who had wronged him, and would not repent when spoken to in private, says that he must complain to the Church; and then, if the offender did not *hear the Church*, he should no longer be treated as a fellow-Christian. Certain persons arguing with you, quote this as the Lord's command to us, that in forming our religious opinions we must only—"HEAR THE CHURCH"!! [My reader, this will be often quoted in the "Doctrinal Catechism," in the following pages, for the same purpose. Tell me, now, what do you think of the wisdom and candor of such reasoning, and of the cause that needs such arguments?]

Q. Can you cite any thing from Scripture *against* the notion, that we are always to believe without doubting whatever the pastors of the Church teach?

A. Many such things. For instance, St. Paul says: "But though *we*, or *an angel from heaven*, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."* He is blaming certain persons for believing some false doctrines which they had lately heard preached. So he commands all Christians to *judge for themselves* about what they hear preached, and to reject what even *the chief teachers of the Church* declare, if it be against the old faith *as we have it in the written Word of God*.

Q. What was the opinion of the first Christians about this?

A. Just what I have just said. (St.) Athanasius: "For the holy and divinely inspired Scriptures *are of themselves sufficient for the discovery of the truth*."† (St.) Augustine: "Whether it be about Christ, or about His Church, or about whatsoever other things which

him alone. If he shall hear thee, thou shalt gain thy brother. And if he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may stand. And if he will not hear them, tell the Church. And if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican." (Douay Bible.) How foolish it is, to say that the Protestants have a different and a false Bible!

* Gal 1:8: "But though we or an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema." (Douay Bible.)

† Orat. cont. Gent.

pertain to your faith and life, I say not if we, but if an angel from heaven, shall declare to you any thing beside what you have received *in the Scriptures of the Law and Gospel*, let him be accursed.”* You see here the very words of St. Paul, quoted above by me, quoted and applied in the same sense by Augustine.

Q. Do Luther's words, quoted on page 37 by the Doctrinal Catechism, prove that the Reformed doctrines were never heard of before him, and that we ought blindly to “hear the Church” in the way it argues?

A. No: they only show with what candor he describes the struggle in his mind between old prejudices and newly found truth. His modesty in hesitating to oppose the prevailing opinions of the Church, even when it had plainly (as we shall presently see) wandered from the truth of the Holy Scriptures, marks a serious and humble soul.

[NOTE on the “Fathers.”—It is very common in religious disputes among Christians to quote the words of the early and most famous Christian writers, commonly called “the Fathers,” as, Athanasius, Augustine, etc. If, then, we find some very plain words of theirs on either side of this controversy, what weight shall we allow them? Shall we say that they decide the question, and can not be wrong? It may surprise some persons, when I state, that not even the learned writers of the Roman Church say this: all agree that this would be putting the words of men, however wise and pious, on a level with the words of God in the Scriptures. (See below, Cardinal Cajétan; also, Salmeron, Petavius, Maldonatus, etc., etc.)

(St.) Augustine himself, perhaps the greatest one of all the Fathers, says in a letter to (St.) Jerome: “I confess to thy charity, that I have learned to pay to *those books of Scripture alone* which are now called canonical, such reverence and honor as to believe most firmly that none of their authors ever committed any error in writing them. And if by chance I there meet with any thing which seems to contradict the truth, I think at once, that either my copy is imperfect, or that

* Liter. Petil iii. c. 6.

the translator has varied from the original, or that I myself have not understood him. But as for *all other writers*, however eminent they are for sanctity or learning, I read them in such a manner as not to conclude at once, that any thing is true because they have thought so, but because they have been *able to convince me*, either *from those CANONICAL writers*, or by some probable reason, that what they say is true.*

For what may we, then, fairly quote the Fathers in this controversy? Mainly, to show what was *probably* the opinion of Christians generally in their day, and what was the natural meaning of the words of Scripture, as these were understood before prejudice and party spirit wrangled over them as they have, since opposing doctrines have appeared among Christians. The Fathers will be valuable to us for this, in proportion as they lived near the times of the Apostles. That they are to be used with caution even for this purpose, is plain from the following things, which are clearly proved in the candid and thorough treatise "On the Right Use of the Fathers," by the learned Jean Daillé.

1. There is very little left of the writings of the Fathers in the first three centuries, which has any thing to do with the present controversies.

2. The writings which bear the names of the Fathers for even the first six or more centuries, are not all genuine—many such having been forged soon after their time, and others long afterward.

3. Those which are probably genuine have been corrupted in many places by time, ignorance, and fraud.

4. They are difficult to be understood on account of the languages and the styles in which they are written.

5. The Fathers in many places say (as they elsewhere admit) what is not their own real opinion.

6. They sometimes, in their later writings, contradict what they had said before.

7. It is not always easy to decide whether they hold an opinion as *certainly*, or only as *probably* true.

* Ep. ad Hier. 19.

8. When we have the opinion of one of these Fathers, we can not often tell whether that was the opinion of the Church generally in his day; and it is quite impossible to determine in any way what was the general opinion of the Church in those times, about the matters in dispute now between the Reformed and the Roman Churches.

9. The Fathers say themselves, (as, see Augustine, above,) that they are not to be believed, except as they prove what they say from the Holy Scriptures.

10. Many of their writings are so hasty and inaccurate, as to show that they themselves plainly did not expect to be referred to as authority.

11. They have in fact erred, not only singly, but sometimes many of them together, as the Roman Church itself declares. One of its chief writers, De Vio, Cardinal Cajetan, says, (Pref. in Pent. :) "If you chance, then, to meet with any new exposition which is agreeable to the text, and not contrary either to the Scriptures or to the doctrine of the Church, *although perhaps it differs from that which is given by the whole current of the holy doctors*, I shall desire the readers that they would not too hastily reject it, but rather judge it charitably. Let them remember to give every man his due. This authority has been reserved to the Holy Scriptures alone, that we must believe things to be so, just because they have so written. But as for others, (says Augustine,) of however great sanctity and learning, I so read them as not to believe what they have written merely because they have written it. Let no one, therefore, reject a new exposition of some passage of Holy Scripture, because it is contrary to what the ancient doctors gave. But *let him examine the more carefully the text and the context of the Scripture*; and if he finds it to square with that, let him praise God, who has not tied the exposition of the Holy Scriptures to the sense of the ancient doctors, but to the whole Scripture itself, under the judgment of the Catholic Church."

12. The Fathers have contradicted one another, and that in matters of great importance.

13. The Roman, as well as the Reformed Churches, has not hesitated to reject some of their opinions and practices, because opposed to its doctrines or ceremonies. (Conc. Trent, Ses. xxi. c. 4.)

[You will observe, also, that in opposing the false doctrines of the Roman Church, we quote the very copies of the Fathers which have been in the hands of that Church, and are allowed by it. I myself have, with my own eyes, seen the passages which I cite, in the books published at Rome and elsewhere by the Jesuits, Benedictines, and other clergy of that Church. Whatever, then, the Doctrinal Catechism finds in these writings for its side, can have nothing like the weight of what I quote against it. May I not say, with overwhelming force: "*Out of thine own mouth I condemn thee*"? So, also, should it quote from one of the Fathers some words for its side, and I one as plain for us—which passage, think you, if either, is not genuine, but has been since put in by some one to support his doctrines?]

CHAP. IV.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What think you of the schism caused by Luther? Can one prudently believe that it is the work of God?

A. No; because God himself has forbidden schism as a dreadful crime; St. Paul (1st Corinthians 1:10) says: "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the *same thing*, and that there be no SCHISMS among you; but that you be *perfect in the same mind and same judgment*."

Q. What idea did Luther himself entertain about schism before he blinded himself by his infuriated antipathy to the Pope?

A. He declared, that it was not lawful for any Christian whatever to separate himself from the Church of Rome.

Q. Repeat the very words of Luther touching this important matter. (Tom. i. p. 116, b.)

A. "There is no question, no matter how important,

which will justify a separation from the Church." Yet, notwithstanding, he himself burst the moorings which bound him to the Church, and, with his small band of ignorant and reckless followers, opposed her by every means in his power.

Q. What do you remark on historical examples of conduct similar to this ever since the birth of Christianity?

A. That in every age, when a small body detached itself from the Church, on account of doctrinal points, it has been universally the case, that the small body plunged by degrees deeper and deeper into error and heresy, and in the end, brought by its own increasing corruption into a state of decomposition, disappeared and perished. Of this we have hundreds of examples; nor can Lutherans or Calvinists reasonably hope, that their heresy and schism can have any other end. They are walking in the footsteps of those who have strayed from the fold of truth, from the unity of faith; and they can have no other prospect, than the end of so many heresies that have gone before them.

CHAP. IV.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What were the "schisms" against which St. Paul warned the Corinthian Christians?

A. Personal quarrels and parties (of which, however, he does *not* speak "as a dreadful crime.")

Q. How did the Reformed Churches separate from the Roman?

A. To say nothing of whether they ought not to have quit those who, though shown their errors, still persisted in the false doctrines of the Dark Ages, they were *not allowed* by that Church to remain in union with it; but, because they taught pure doctrine, were rejected from it with curses and threats, and, when possible, persecuted with prisons and death. Yet they say that the Reformers "*detached themselves*" from that Church! As for separating from *the Holy Catholic Church*, the entire society of Christ's people, they still

remained a part of it (and the best part in this world.) The presence of our Lord with his people does not depend upon numbers, but upon true service to him. The smallest number separated in this way, have the glory and authority of the Church, rather than the numerous body which they leave.

Q. How does the history of the Reformed Churches since this separation, compare with that of the factions and heresies of the first ages?

A. Unlike them, the Reformation has not only maintained itself in great power for three centuries and a half, but is moving on to the dominion of the whole world.

CHAP. V.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Why have you said, that the means adopted by Luther, to establish his new religion, were not of God? What were those means?

A. That he might secure followers, he employed such means as were calculated to flatter the passions of men; he strewed the path to heaven—not like Christ with *thorns*, but like the devil—with *flowers*; he took off the *cross* which Christ had laid on the shoulders of men; he made *wide* and *easy* the way which Christ had left *narrow* and *difficult*.

Q. Repeat some of Luther's *improvements* upon the religion of Christ.

A. He permitted all who had made solemn vows of chastity, to violate their vows and marry; he permitted temporal sovereigns to plunder the property of the Church; he abolished confession, abstinence, fasting, and every work of penance and mortification.

Q. How did he attempt to tranquillize the consciences he had disturbed by these scandalously libertine doctrines?

A. He invented a thing which he called justifying faith, to be a sufficient substitute for all the above painful religious works, an invention which took off every responsibility from our shoulders, and laid all on the shoulders of Jesus Christ; in a word, he told men to

believe in the merits of Christ as *certainly applied to them*, and live as they pleased, to indulge every criminal passion, without even the restraints of modesty.

Q. How did he strive to gain over to his party a sufficient number of presumptuous, unprincipled, and dissolute men of talent, to preach and propagate his novelties?

A. He pandered to their passions and flattered their pride, by granting them the sovereign honor of being their own judges in every religious question; he presented them with the Bible, declaring that each one of them, ignorant and learned, was perfectly qualified to decide upon every point of controversy.

Q. What did he condescend to do for Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, in order to secure his support and protection?

A. He permitted him to keep two wives at one and the same time. The name of the second was Margaret de Saal, who had been maid of honor to his lawful wife, Christina de Saxe. Nor was Luther the only *Protestant* Doctor who granted this monstrous dispensation from the law of God; eight of the most celebrated Protestant leaders signed, with their own hand, the filthy and adulterous document.

Q. Does the whole history of Christianity furnish us with even one such scandalous dispensation derived from ecclesiastical authority?

A. No; nor could such brutal profligacy be countenanced even for a moment, seeing that the Scripture is so explicit on the subject. Gen. 2, Matt. 19, Mark 10, speak of two in one flesh, but never of three. But Luther and his brethren were guided, not by the letter of the Scripture, but by the corrupt passions, wishes, and inclinations of men. To induce their followers to swallow the new creed, they gave them, in return, liberty to gratify every appetite.

CHAP. V.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Did Luther and the other Reformers secure followers by teaching that men need not keep the commandments of God?

A. This charge is a dreadful untruth. In the Reformed Churches to this day, all the virtues and duties

commanded by God are continually preached to the people.

Q. Do they teach that we obtain the pardon of our sins by any merits or sufferings of our own?

A. No; for, as the Gospel plainly says, it is only for the righteousness and the atonement of our Lord and Saviour that God forgives the sins of believers. Yet good works are the natural fruit of repentance and the love of God in the hearts of such believers; so that they who do not try to please God in that way, can not fairly account themselves to believe in Jesus Christ.

Q. Does the doctrine of the Roman Church, *in fact*, produce better morals than that of the Reformed?

A. Quite the opposite: as we shall soon see, indulgences and priestly forgiveness make many men reckless of sin.

Q. Was Luther guilty of "brutal profligacy" in regard to Philip of Hesse, "in order to secure his support and protection"?

A. It is very unjust to say so. I have examined the history of this whole affair, and the facts are, that *long after* Philip had joined the Reformers, Luther and some others, whose advice Philip had asked in most secret confidence, yielded at last to his weak and blind conscience what they then argued and protested against. Afterward they confessed that they had done wrong in yielding to him at all, and withdrew their approval. It never had any thing to do with obtaining "his support and protection." The whole affair was kept as a confidential family secret many years. It was a mistake of those wise and good men, whom we have never believed to have been *infallible*.*

Q. The Doctrinal Catechism asks: "Does the whole history of Christianity furnish us with even one such scandalous dispensation derived from ecclesiastical authority"?

A. Yes; *at this very time* the Pope sent an ambassador to Germany, with instructions to dispense with even BIGAMY in any of the German princes who would leave the Reformed and return to the Roman Church.† Such

* See Seckendorf, iii. 277.

† Father Paul, i. 544. Probably the Pope had Philip in his mind, as it was rumored that he claimed that for peculiar reasons it was not

dispensations have been granted by Popes from the Ten Commandments!

Q. Did the Reformers owe their success then, to their favoring the pride of men by granting them the right of "private judgment" in regard to religion?

A. No; for this "private judgment" has nothing to do with men's pride or passions, but is a part of our necessary and responsible free will, of which no man can divest himself or deprive another person. I know men who understand this so, who are yet very humble and pious. The *Doctrinal Catechism itself*, in the next chapter, calls upon you to use your "private judgment" on its side.

CHAP. VI.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. If neither the author of Protestantism, nor his work itself, nor the means he adopted to effect his purpose, are from God, what are his followers obliged to?

A. They are obliged, under pain of eternal damnation, to seek earnestly and reënter the true Church, which, seduced by Luther, they abandoned: if they be sincere, God will aid them in their inquiry.

Q. What is the situation of the man who does not at once acquit himself of this obligation?

A. He is the victim of mortal heresy and schism; the thing he calls a Church has no pastors lawfully sent or ordained; hence, he can receive none of the Sacraments declared in Scripture to be so necessary to salvation.

Q. What think you of those (they are many) who are at heart convinced that the Catholic Church is the only true one, and are still such cowards as to dread making a public profession of their faith?

A. "He," says our Saviour, Luke 9: 26, "who shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him the Son

wrong for him to have two wives like the old patriarchs. All princes in those times seem to have had low notions of these virtues. A still stronger instance of this is, that Charles V. and other monarchs, while in great honor in the Roman Church and fiercely persecuting the Reformed—called by the Pope his "dear sons in the faith," etc., and even imagining themselves very pious—were living in open adultery.

of man shall be ashamed, when he shall come in his majesty."

Q. What think you of those who are inclined to Catholicism, but out of family considerations neglect to embrace it?

A. Our Saviour, in the 10th chap. of St. Matt., tells such, that he who loves father or mother more than God, is unworthy of God.

Q. What say you to those who become Protestants, or remain Protestants, from motives of worldly gain or honor?

A. I say with our Saviour, in the 8th chap. of St. Mark, "What will it avail a man, if he gain the whole world, and suffer the loss of his soul?"

CHAP. VI.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. As every one must make his free choice between the Reformers and those who opposed them, what is *your* duty in regard to this?

A. My duty plainly is, to go with those who hold the old and pure faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, however few and poor they may be, and to forsake those who hold to the corruption of it, however rich and numerous.

Q. Will it excuse me from this duty that I was brought up in the wrong belief; that my parents held it sincerely; that my friends and kindred will be angry with me for the change; that some will call me an apostate, or that I will be injured by it in my business?

A. No; for I "must obey God rather than men," and forsake all things, if need be, for my Saviour. The heathen and infidels have as good a right to continue in their sins for these reasons, as I have to remain on the wrong side after I am once convinced of the truth.

Q. If you have *doubts* whether you are in the right way, may you refuse to think about it, saying that this will lead you away from the truth, and that "you may safely leave the responsibility of your faith to your pastor, and simply believe all that he teaches"?

A. No; for God has made it *my private duty* to judge what I ought to believe, and I can not lay it upon an-

other person. If I am unwilling to inquire humbly and honestly what the truth of God is, I may well tremble for the safety of my soul.



On the True Church of Jesus Christ.

CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Can any one be saved who is not in the true Church?

A. No; for those who are not in the true Church, that is, for those who are not joined, at least, to the soul of the Church,* there can be no hope of salvation.

Q. What says Christ upon this subject? (St. Matt. chap. 18.)

A. That he who will not hear the Church, is to be reputed as a heathen.

Q. What says St. Cyprian? (Lib. de Unit. Eccl.)

A. "That he who has not the Church for his mother, can not have God for his father;" and the Fathers generally say, "That as all who were not in the ark of Noah, perished in the waters of the deluge; so shall all perish, who are without the pale of the true Church."

Q. What is the meaning of the ninth article of the Creed: "I believe in the holy Catholic Church"?

A. That every one should firmly believe, that to be a member of the Catholic Church, is necessary in order to salvation.

Q. By what marks can you distinguish the true Church from all other sects?

A. Particularly by two: 1st, Whatever pretends to be the Church of Christ must have been established upwards of eighteen hundred years ago, by Christ and his Apostles. 2d, It must have existed *unceasingly* in the world from that time to the present.

* This question, as it regards Pagans and *invincibly* ignorant Christians, will be treated afterwards.

Q. Why do you say that Christ's Church must have been established more than eighteen hundred years ago?

A. Because it was Christ who established *his own true Church*, and it is more than eighteen hundred years since he left the world, to which he has never since visibly returned.

Q. Why do you say that a church, to be the true Church of Christ, must have perpetually existed, without any interruption, since the time Christ established it?

A. Simply, because Christ promised such perpetuity to *his Church*.

Q. What are the words of Christ on this subject? (Matt. 16 : 18, and Matt. 28 : 20.)

A. "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it;" and, "Go, therefore, teach all nations . . . and lo! *I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.*"

Q. How does St. Paul speak of the Church of Christ? (1 Tim. 3.)

A. He calls her the *pillar and ground of truth*.

Q. Were it true that the Church had in reality fallen into idolatry, what inference would you draw from that fact?

A. That Christ was an unskilled architect and a false prophet; because he must then have built his Church, not upon a rock, but upon sand, like that stupid architect of whom he himself speaks—Matt. chap. 8; and because the gates of hell would then have really prevailed against the Church in spite of his prediction.

Q. What conclusion do you draw from all this?

A. That Christ established a Church; that that Church has existed in every age; that she exists at present; that she never could, and never can, fall into any error dangerous to salvation on matters of faith or morality; that every one, in fine, is bound with a firm and unshaken faith to believe what she teaches, because her doctrines are, like those of her Divine Master, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What is that one only condition without which no one can be saved?

A. That he should belong to the people of our Lord and Saviour the Son of God; for God has said by St. Paul,* “As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive,” and by St. John,† “God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son; he that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.”

Q. How do men join the people of Christ?

A. By penitently and obediently believing the message which God has sent to man by Him, called the Gospel. All whom our Lord sees to do this in their hearts,‡ he numbers among his subjects, and these in the highest sense form his CHURCH.

Q. God alone certainly knows who thus belong to the Church in their hearts; but how is the Church also a public society?

A. Our Lord instructed the holy Apostles, the first bishops, to set up in each place a society which each believer in him ought publicly to join. By these he keeps up the love and holiness of his people, the education of their children in the same good way, the care of the Holy Scriptures, public worship, and the preaching of the Gospel to unbelievers. All these companies in the world together form what may be called *the body* of that Church of which *all believers in heart are the soul*.

Q. Who is the chief ruler of the Universal (or Catholic) Church?

A. Our Lord Jesus Christ reigning in heaven but governing the Church on earth by providence, by his unseen spiritual presence, and by its pastors.

* 1 Cor. 15 : 22. So also the Douay Bible.

† 1 John 5 : 11, 12. So also the Douay Bible.

‡ And, we may suppose, all who, though they have never heard the Gospel, have that penitent and obedient heart which would so believe it, if heard.

Q. Are all Christians in fact in this world under *one central government* of pastors, as all the people of this country are under one Congress and President?

A. No; but different congregations are collected into large societies or churches, according to their different countries, and their different opinions in the less important matters of religion, as the various Reformed Churches, the Greek Church, the Roman Church, etc. These are independent of one another, but all together form so much of the one Catholic or Universal Church as is in this world.

Q. Suppose that one of these societies should claim to be wholly and alone the true Church; what would be necessary in order to make good this claim?

A. For that Church to show (1) that it alone maintained the faithful teaching of the Gospel as found in the New Testament, and (2) that those under its influence lived far the best in virtue and piety.

Q. But passing by these great tests for the present, what say you to these two proofs: (1) its having been established 1800 years ago by Christ and his Apostles, and (2) the having existed unceasingly in the world from that time to the present?

A. They are not without value in determining this question; for our Lord said that "the gates of hell should not prevail" against the Church, and that he would be with his people "always to the end of the world."

Q. If then the Church afterward fell into general idolatry and held much false doctrine, would that falsify those promises?

A. No; for we may well believe that He *has* always kept in the world some sincere and obedient believers, even in the worst of times. Thus the soul of the Church (which is of most consequence) has always been kept alive on the earth. Nor has the Lord at any time allowed its *body* to perish entirely for the purposes of *its* existence, namely, the care of his people, the safe-keeping of the Scriptures, and the continuing of his sacraments and ministry. This is just like the history of his old Church, (that is, the Israelites under the law of Moses,) which was a figure of the perfect Church of the New Testament. For he was "always with" that people to save them from utter destruction, though they at times fell into gross disobedience and general idolatry.

CHAP. II.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. In what Church do you find those two certain marks of truth, of which you have spoken?

A. In the Catholic Church, and in no other.

Q. Was she established eighteen hundred years ago?

A. Yes; for no man has ever yet been able to date her origin from any later period.

Q. Has she existed always, without even the least interruption, during that time?

A. Yes; and no one has ever ventured to point out such interruption, or how long, if it took place at all, such interruption lasted.

Q. How does St. Augustine establish this necessary antiquity and perpetuity of the Church up to his own time? (Epist. a Gener.)

A. He proves it by the uninterrupted succession of Roman Pontiffs, whose names he gives, one after the other, for the complete period, to the number of thirty-nine.

Q. How many Popes have governed the Church from St. Peter to the present Pontiff, Gregory the XVI., inclusively?

A. Two hundred and fifty-six.

Q. Are the two certain marks of the true Church, of which you have spoken, discoverable in the Protestant Church?

A. No; neither in the Episcopal, nor Calvinistic branch of it.

Q. How long is it since the Lutheran Church was established?

A. About three hundred years—Luther preached the first Protestantism ever known in 1517; and Calvinism was first preached in the year 1537.

Q. Were there no Lutheran or Calvinistic Churches before these dates?

A. No; no such doctrines, nor churches, nor pastors, nor sects, were ever known in any country prior to that time.

Q. How do you reason from these facts against your adversaries?

A. Any church, to be the true Church, must have been established eighteen hundred years ago; but the Episcopalian and Presbyterian Churches are only of

three hundred years' duration; therefore, neither of them can have any pretension to be the Church of Christ.

Q. May not your adversaries reply, that the Church of the first four centuries believed as they do; that, at the end of that time, the Church fell into superstition and idolatry; and that God judged it necessary, after the Church was drowned in error for eleven hundred years, to send Luther and Calvin to reform her?

A. Yes, they may, and do advance many absurdities, and this is one of them, which does not bring them out of their difficulties; for Christ says: His Church can not fail—that the gates of hell shall never prevail against her—that his *Holy Spirit shall teach her all truth* **FOR-
EVER**—that he will abide with her **ALL DAYS, even to the consummation of the world.** Therefore it is an infallible truth, that any Church to be the Church of Christ, must have been established eighteen hundred years ago; therefore, that Church once established, could never fail; therefore the Protestant Church, the mere child of yesterday, can not be the Church of Christ; therefore her very foundation is nothing but error and blasphemy, for she is built on the supposition, that Christ was either **UNWILLING** or **UNABLE** to keep his promise—a supposition which implies the most aggravated blasphemy, tantamount to a denial of the Divinity of Christ.

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. The Roman Church claims to be alone the true and Catholic Church, that is, to be *the whole* of it; does it appear to be so by the two great marks of pure doctrine and holiness of life in its people?

A. While we joyfully recognize these in some of its teachings and some of its members, it is *in general* so very far from them as to create a painful doubt whether it is any *part* of the Church at all.

Q. How do its claims bear the two inferior tests of being established by Christ and the Apostles, and continued unceasingly since?

A. It is certain that the peculiar doctrines which it maintains against the Reformed Churches, were never heard of until long after the times of the Apostles, as we shall presently *prove*.

Q. Was not the pure Gospel preached in the city of Rome by St. Paul, and a church established there, and have there not been bishops in Rome ever since?

A. Yes; but soon after the days of the Apostles, new and false notions began to be mixed with the old faith in the minds of Christians generally. And this went on increasing for several hundred years, until in "the Dark Ages," when the Holy Scriptures were scarcely read at all, the common belief of Christians was much changed, and the outward Church in almost all Europe had become a great tyranny, over which the bishop of Rome reigned, with the title of *Pope*. The "Greek Church," as it was called, which prevailed among the Eastern nations, was only less corrupt in doctrine than the Roman. When the Reformation began, as we have seen before, the Pope, and most of the bishops who had been used to obey him, opposed it, and persisted in the false doctrine. So a large part of Europe remains to this day under the Church of Rome, sometimes called the "Roman Catholic" Church, and often styling itself "*the Catholic Church*."

Q. Why is it improper to call the Roman Church, *Catholic*?

A. Because the word *Catholic* means universal, or general, or entire; and the Roman Church is far from being the whole Church. For instance, the Greek Church, which, in every sense that the Roman Church can be called *old*, is older yet—is entirely distinct from it, and has refused to commune with it for a thousand years, on account of the tyranny and the false doctrines of the Popes. So, also, the Reformed Churches had to leave it to itself three hundred and fifty years ago, because it would persist in its errors.

* Some Protestants carelessly use this expression out of mere good nature, because their adversaries have such a distaste for those words which fairly (and not abusively) distinguish them; as, "Papists," that is, adherents of the Pope; or "Romanists," that is, subjects of the Roman Church. I have usually described that Church by one of its own chosen titles, (which at the same time contains no falsehood,) as "the Roman Church." As for making the thoughtless use of the word *Catholic*, (usually by those who care least for that word,) mentioned above, a serious argument for the Roman Church—it is hardly worthy of a serious answer. There is a little heretical sect in this country who call themselves "the Christians." What if they should claim the fact that some others may mention them by that name as a proof that they are the only Christians?

CHAP. III.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What question can you put to a Protestant, to which he can give no satisfactory reply ?

A. Ask him where the true Church was before the time of Luther and Calvin.

Q. May he not reply, that the Church was then invisible, that there were Christians in every age who held the doctrines of Luther and Calvin, but that they dared not openly profess their faith ?

A. Yes ; but this answer will satisfy no man of ordinary understanding ; for surely, it must be evident to every one who thinks, that men who believed in their hearts one creed and professed another, like these INVISIBLE Protestants, were only hypocrites, dastardly traitors to their religion, utterly incapable of composing the holy, fearless body of the true Church of Christ.

Q. Was not the Jewish Church for a time invisible, and did not God say to the prophet Elias, that there were seven thousand men concealed who had never bent the knee to Baal ?

A. When the Jewish Church was invisible in the kingdom of Israel, it was in a most flourishing state in the land of Judah ; but the Protestant Church existed in no kingdom during the years of its invisibility, nor have we the Word of God assuring us, that there were seven thousand invisible Protestants concealed under a cloud any where.

Q. Have you any other reply to make ?

A. Yes ; there is a very great difference between the *Christian* and the *Jewish* Church — God never promised that he would be with the Jewish Church *all days*, that the gates of hell should not prevail against her.

Q. Have you any other way of proving that the true Church must have been always visible ?

A. If the Church had not been always visible, it would have been impossible to obey the command of Christ—that we should *hear* and obey his Church. The Church is composed of men teaching and men taught, and are these invisible ? Are preaching, pub-

lie prayer, baptism, the administration of the other sacraments, duties that can be performed invisibly? Is not the subterfuge of an invisible Church a mere absurdity? May not any Mormon, Millerite, or madman, declare his nostrums the true religion, hitherto invisible, now at length revealed?

CHAP. III.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Are you confounded by the question: "Where was the true Church before Luther"?

A. No; for I have already seen that it had been maintained in a wonderful manner by the Lord amid the most unfavorable circumstances, even while in the Dark Ages its body was in a very diseased and deformed state. (I behold a tree which surely *began* with a healthy growth. But there are withered and dying branches springing from the main trunk, while only at the top I see green and living boughs. Can I not use my senses to see that these last are the natural and healthy growth, and such as the tree was at first; while the others need to be pruned and cured, or else cut off? "No," says the Doctrinal Catechism; "these dead branches are the true growth—and they are green and living too—because they were there before the others; and the tree when young and first growing, was just like them.") The care and love of our Almighty Lord for the Church was displayed most of all in bringing about the Reformation, which, let us pray, that he would now complete throughout the world.

Q. Does not the history of the Jewish Church show that the people of God may fall into great errors without his entirely abandoning them?

A. Yes; for the people of Judah also thus fell away *after* the kingdom of Israel had fallen into general idolatry, and even after it had utterly perished*—notwithstanding the bold untruth of the Doctrinal Catechism, (see p. 57,)—that "When the Jewish Church

* 2 Kings 21, 2 Chron. 23.

was invisible in the kingdom of Israel, it was in a most flourishing state in the land of Judah"! So God kept them as his people and Church, notwithstanding their corruptions and sins, until our Lord came down from heaven for man's complete redemption.

CHAP. IV.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Have our adversaries any other reply to make to that, for them, annoying question: "Where was the Church of God before Luther's time?"

A. Yes; some of them say, that the Church of Christ was that of the Hussites, the Vaudois, and other heretics of the twelfth century, and that the Protestant Church is only a continuation of it under a different name.

Q. Can this reply be sustained by argument?

A. No; for, in the first place, though the principles of these heretics differed in some points from the Catholic faith, yet their doctrine generally agreed with the Catholic, and differed widely from that of Luther and Calvin. Therefore, inasmuch as they held the Mass, seven sacraments, etc., they must have been idolaters according to Protestants; and inasmuch as they held doctrines opposed to Protestants, they can not be considered as forming one and the same Church. Besides, even admitting, what is not the fact, for the sake of argument, that the Hussites, etc., were Protestants, this only makes the Protestant sect two or three hundred years older; it leaves still twelve hundred years of non-existence to be accounted for—this is an awful chasm. Where, still we ask, during this long period, was the Church of Christ? What other prior sect of heretics can Protestants link themselves with, in order to stretch out their existence over all these ages? None; and if not, then still they do not form the Church of Christ; because they can not connect their Church in any possible way with Christ or his Apostles.

Q. What say you to those who admit that the Catholic Church was the true Church up to Luther's time, but that many errors and abuses had crept into her, which it was necessary to correct?

A. If the Catholic Church was the Church of Christ before Luther, she must be so still; hence, those who have left her are, to say the least, schismatics. Again, either these supposed errors were prejudicial to salvation, or they were not. If they were, then Christ has failed in his word—then the gates of hell have prevailed against the Church, and this in the very teeth of Christ's promises and security to the contrary. If these errors were not prejudicial to salvation, then they were only the errors of individuals, not the errors of the *Church-teaching*; and, accordingly, it was merely necessary to correct the individuals, but on every account to cling to the Church, as *the pillar and ground of truth*; to act otherwise, was to be guilty of the dreadful crime of schism, so awfully denounced by St. Paul.

Q. May not these people say, that it was we who separated from them, not they from us?

A. No; for when there are two bodies—one of which is great, the other small—one ancient, the other modern—one teaching the doctrine of a long series of ages, the other teaching a new creed—it is evidently not the great or the ancient, both in existence and doctrine, but the small and modern body which becomes responsible for the separation: a small portion detached from a mountain can never with propriety be called the mountain itself.

CHAP. IV.—THE OTHER SIDE. .

Q. What was the belief of the pious members of the Church through those truly "*Dark Ages*"?

A. In proportion as they knew the true Gospel, and had the enlightenment of the Holy Ghost, which is given to all who truly pray for it, they believed and loved those same divine truths which we now hold: namely, that our Lord, the Son of God, came into the world to save sinners by dying to atone for our sins;

and that all who repent of their sins, believe on him, and love God in the obedient service of this his Son—are pardoned, born again, made his children, guided by the Holy Ghost in this life, and received to glory in heaven at last.

But copies of the Scriptures were very rare and costly in those days, and most of them not in the language understood by the people. On the other hand, they *were* all taught the corrupt doctrines from their earliest youth, and even many of the best believed them, so great is the power of education and prejudice. We have reason to fear that vast numbers never learned any thing else, and so had no more knowledge of true religion than the pagans. Yet, so great is the contradiction between these false doctrines and the Word of God that from time to time, in every age, men would arise to protest against them at the risk of dreadful persecution. Even *large societies* of such brave and wise Christians maintained themselves at times for a while, until mercilessly slaughtered by the soldiers of the Popes with fire and sword.

Q. Ought the Reformers to have remained in the Church while reforming its errors?

A. *They did so.* They opposed the falsehoods which had *intruded into the Church*. As we have seen before, those who persisted in these errors would not even permit them to try to remain in open fellowship with them, but reviled, threatened, and *excommunicated* them all—and, when they could, imprisoned and killed them.

Q. In such a case, who are rather the true Church, which has the royal presence of our Lord Jesus Christ to the end of the world?

A. The faithful and persecuted, however few they may be; while those who oppose them have all the guilt and damage of schism.

CHAP. V.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Are there any other marks of the true Church ?

A. Yes ; four, enumerated in the Nicene Creed : “ I believe in *One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.*”

Q. Did Christ require unity in his Church ?

A. He says, John 10 : 16, that there is but “ *ONE fold, and ONE shepherd.*” St. Paul, Rom. 12 : 5, says : “ *We, being many, are ONE BODY in Christ ;*” and Ephes., chap. 4 : that there is but “ *one body, one spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism.*” The Church, therefore, is one body or fold, having one faith, under one shepherd.

Q. What do you conclude from this ?

A. That no Church can be the Church of Christ which has not this *oneness* or unity.

Q. Is the Protestant Church one ?

A. On principle it can not be one ; for its first principle—“ private interpretation ”—has ever produced, and will ever produce, necessarily, schisms and divisions ; each one, learned or ignorant, interprets according to his peculiar light or interest.

Q. Is the Protestant Church one in its government ?

A. No : it has for its head, the King in Prussia, the Queen or State in England ; and in Scotland, the government is various, according to the whims of the various sects.

Q. Is the Catholic Church one in her government ?

A. Yes ; all the Catholics in the world are subject to their priests, these priests are subject to their bishops, and these bishops are appointed by, and subject to, Peter's lawful successor in the See of Rome.

Q. Is the Protestant Church one in her faith ?

A. She has one faith in England, and another in Scotland, a third in Switzerland, and a fourth in Prussia. The Free Kirk of Scotland holds as damnable, what the Established Kirk believes to be good and

true; and the Puseyite believes what the English Church repudiates. In one Protestant Church, bishops, and ordination by bishops, are believed to be necessary; in another they are rejected. One Protestant body believes in the real presence; and another, in a bare and empty memorial. All the minor Protestant sects are in the same melancholy predicament—they differ from one another on some or many essential points.

Q. Is the Catholic Church one in her faith?

A. All the Catholics in the world have one and the same creed. Amongst Catholics there are no sects—no Church of *Scotland*, or *England*, or *France*: All Catholics believe the same truths, and to reject any one of these truths, is to cut one's self off from the Catholic communion. The Catholic Church is the Church, not of any nation, but of the world.

Q. Is the Protestant Church one in her moral doctrines?

A. No; one sect of Protestants believes in *predestination*, in salvation by *faith alone*; and another sect of Protestants holds the necessity of good works and free will, whilst they denounce the above Calvinistic principles, as leading directly to the most debasing immorality.

Q. Is the Catholic Church one in her moral principles?

A. All Catholics follow the same moral principles—the same vices are denounced on the one hand, and the same virtues inculcated on the other.

Q. Is the Protestant discipline every where the same?

A. It is different in every country and every sect.

Q. Is the Catholic Church one on this head?

A. The Catholic Church is strictly uniform on every essential matter of discipline, whether that regard the pastors or the people—the same great feasts and fasts are every where observed.

Q. Is the Protestant Church one in her Liturgy or public service?

A. No; on this she exhibits the most absurd contrariety—Scotland worships God in one way, England

in another, Geneva in a third, Prussia in a fourth, Sweden in a fifth, and wherever a handful of Protestants can be assembled together, they strike out a service for themselves, according to their particular views.

Q. Is the Catholic Liturgy every where uniform ?

A. The same great sacrifice of the Mass, and essentially in the same words, is every where offered ; the same seven sacraments are every where administered in the same manner ; even the forms of the public service are every where essentially the same.

Q. What inference do you draw from all this ?

A. That the Protestant Church is a *house divided against itself*—that it is not *one*, but manifold ; therefore, it is not the Church of Christ : That the Catholic Church is one strictly in every sense of the word ; and, consequently, that as it is the only Church on earth which has perfect unity, it is unquestionably the one true Church of Christ.

Q. Are not Protestants one, because they all *follow the Bible* ?

A. On the contrary, it is the Bible, abused by the principle of private interpretation, which occasions all their errors, heresies, and schisms. The Prussian Mucker teaches his filthy principles from the Bible ; the silly Mormon palms his nostrums on the Bible ; the execrable Socialist proves his brutalities from the Bible ; the Millerite extracts Millerism from the Bible : in a word, Methodists, Baptists, Quakers, Episcopalians, Lutherans, Presbyterians—all pervert God's Word in order to make it support their jarring and contradictory systems ; and they do this with as much assurance, as if God could teach that black is white, or that a thing may be black and white at the same time. Thus, amongst the Presbyterians of Scotland, one sect teaches that Church patronage is damnable, whilst another teaches that it is a good thing.

CHAP. V.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Has the Universal Church of Christ a "Unity"?

A. Yes, it is the "one body" of our Lord. Indeed, to say, "*the Church*," of course means *one Church*; as when I say, "the man," I mean *one man*.

Q. Is it necessary to this *unity* of the Church that all of its members should have precisely the same opinions in religion?

A. No: for all who are joined to our Lord and Redeemer by a penitent faith in, and an obedient love for, him, (though they differ from one another in other things,) are "one body in Christ." Otherwise it might as well be said, that we Americans could not form one nation unless we all thought just alike about every matter of politics.

Q. Is it necessary to the *unity* of the Church that all its members should be under one central human government?

A. No: for in the days of the Apostles the "churches" of different countries and cities were independent of one another, yet forming one Catholic Church in brotherly love, and in serving the one invisible Lord in heaven. "Then had *the churches* rest," etc.* So our Lord wrote to "the *seven Churches* of Asia," by St. John, in the book of Revelation, (without saying a word to them about obeying the Roman Church.) There are *more than thirty such passages* in the New Testament, and *all the early* Christian writers speak in the same way; while the notion of one man's ruling over the Universal Church was not heard of for many hundred years afterward, (as we will *prove* by and by.)

Q. What constitutes the general public body which we usually call "the Church" in this world?

A. The various national or other churches which agree in the main doctrines of the Gospel, and maintain the ministry and sacraments of Christ.

* Acts 9 : 31. The Douay Bible here says, "the Church," following a corrupt reading of the Greek, which the best scholars pronounce "unworthy of notice." However, it has "churches" elsewhere.

Q. What fellowship ought these various parts of the one Catholic Church to have together?

A. An interchange of brotherly love and kind actions, and a vying with one another, and helping one another to bring all the rest of mankind also into this salvation and brotherhood.

Q. Does this fellowship in fact exist as much as it should?

No. The Roman Church refuses to have any thing at all to do with the others, except to excommunicate and curse them. Yet there is a great sympathy among all the Reformed Churches, in spite of partial errors and human passions. And let us earnestly call upon God to put an end to all such differences, thanking him that there are cheering signs already that these evils (which are among the indirect results of the great apostasy of the Dark Ages) will soon disappear before the complete triumph of the Reformation.

Q. Is the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America one of these parts of the Holy Catholic Church?*

A. Yes, perhaps the most perfect of all. It teaches the Gospel in purity; it leads the people to a holy life; it maintains the worship of God in the most devout and lofty form; and it has come down in a direct line from the Lord and his Apostles.

Q. Is the Roman Church one of these parts?

A. This is a most difficult question to answer. That Church professes the chief truths of the Gospel; yet it adds to them so many false doctrines, that the true never get the attention of vast numbers of its communion. It mixes the worship of creatures with that of God. It oppresses its members with a dreadful tyranny. It utters bitter curses against all who differ from it. It has *remained in its errors* since the light of the Reformation shone upon these things. Its policy is one of craft and cruelty. It is defiled with the blood of some of the holiest and most faithful servants of

* Here I speak only for those with whom I fully agree; for, while I defend the common doctrines of all Protestants—the Lord our Saviour be praised for this our holy unity—I shall not affect to defend other opinions which I do not approve, and for which the favorers of them, no doubt, think they do not need my help.

Christ, and its wretched history and future fall are foretold in the Holy Scriptures. Yet, as we think we see in a considerable number of its members a sincere devotion to the Lord of the Church, and in some of them an eminent sanctity, we rejoice that such results can follow His grace amid such adverse conditions; and we prefer to err, if at all, on the side of charity, in recognizing this as a part of the Lord's public body, though certainly the most feeble and diseased part of all.

Q. What do you say of its claim to be the only and entire Church of Christ?

A. This is of course, most absurd and presumptuous. A tyranny under one man is no more necessary or desirable in the Catholic Church than in a nation. According to this notion, the poor, oppressed Italians are more one nation than we are, because they are not allowed to follow, or to express, their own opinions about politics or religion! In fact, however, there have been *bitter disputes* for all ages *in the midst of the Roman Church*, and they *continue to this day*. Some believe in predestination, others denounce this as horribly wrong. Some believe in what they call "the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary:" others reject this with abhorrence.* Nor are these the only controversies among them.

Q. Is it true, as insinuated by the Doctrinal Catechism, (page 63,) that *Protestants do not follow the same moral principles,* etc.?

A. This is a dreadful falsehood.

Q. What do you say in general of the disparaging remarks about Protestants in the preceding chapter of the Doctrinal Catechism?

A. Those which are not very foolish, show that the zeal of this writer, while it has, perhaps, a certain sincerity, is unfair, bitter, and blind.

* Among the latter (Sts.) Bernard, Anselm, and Thomas Aquinas; and four hundred other writers of the highest authority. Also in our day, the Bishops of Holland, the Abbé Laborde, and others.

CHAP. VI.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What is the second mark of the true Church ?

A. Holiness or sanctity.

Q. Does it appear from Scripture, that Christ's Church should be holy ?

A. The prophet Isaiah calls her, Isa. 35 : 8 : "*A way which shall be called THE HOLY WAY, over which the unclean shall not pass.*" David, Ps. 92 : 5, says : "*Holiness becomes thy house, O Lord, for length of days.*" St. Paul, Eph. 5 : 25, declares that "Christ loved the Church and delivered himself for it, that he might *sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water and the word of life, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish.*" See also Tit. 2 : 14, and 1 Peter 2 : 9.

Q. Is the Protestant Church holy in her pastors ?

A. No ; to this she can have no pretension ; her pastors are mere men of the world, not subjected to the restraints of Apostolic poverty, chastity, or mortification. The burden of their religious duty seems to be, the mere preaching of a sermon or two upon Sunday ; whilst most of their time must be employed, not in Apostolic duties, but in looking after their own worldly interest, and that of their wives and children.

Q. Is the Catholic Church holy in her pastors ?

A. They are all separated from the world and its gratifications, and dedicated entirely to God's glory and the sanctification of souls : no worldly cares intrude upon them ; the Church is their spouse, and the people their spiritual children ; they are ever, in a variety of ways, employed in the spiritual improvement of their flock ; they watch with tender care, from the cradle to the grave, those committed to their charge ; and, as they have no wives or families to provide for, their hearts are in their duties ; and whatever of this world's

goods they may possess, is employed for the glory of God.

Q. Are there any means of holiness in the Protestant Church?

A. No; they have destroyed them all: they have rejected the soul of religion in rejecting the holy sacrifice of the Mass, and five of the sacraments, all abundant sources of grace, as you shall afterwards see, where the subjects are treated; and even the two sacraments which they still retain, are by them reduced to mere empty forms—the mere giving of a name, and partaking of a little bread and wine.

Q. Has the Catholic Church means of holiness?

A. Yes; the most abundant, in the holy sacrifice of the Mass and the seven sacraments, which are all so many channels, through which the graces which flow from the wounds of our Redeemer are conveyed to the souls of Catholics of every class, in every condition, and at every period of life, from the time they enter this world, until they render their souls into the hands of God.

Q. Is the Protestant Church holy in her doctrines?

A. The very contradictory nature of the various moral doctrines, taught by the ever-varying sects of Protestants, must, of itself, be ruinous to holiness. But what places the unholiness of her doctrines beyond all doubt, is her doctrine on predestination, on free will, her belief that faith alone is necessary, and that good works are useless; for who, believing such absurdities as these, can have any motive to avoid vice or practise virtue? Holiness is incompatible with these immoral principles.

Q. Is the Catholic Church holy in her doctrines?

A. She teaches her children to believe all that God has revealed, and to practice all that he has commanded; multitudes of Catholics, not content with observing the precepts, practise even the counsels of the Gospel. Fasting, mortification, unremitting prayer, self-denial, and a frequent participation of the sacraments, all of which are so pressingly recommended in the Scripture, are enjoined and practised by the whole Church, from

the sovereign pontiff down to the humblest member of Christ's mystical body.

Q. Were there, in consequence of these holy means and holy doctrines, many members of the Catholic Church illustrious for sanctity?

A. Yes; multitudes, and of every class, from the king to the mendicant, and from the Pope to the deacon.

Q. Have even adversaries admitted this?

A. Yes; the Apology for the Confession of Augsburg, Art. 13, declares that St. Bernard, St. Francis, and St. Bonaventure, were saints; even the Calendar of the Church of England admits others; and almost all our saints are admitted by the Puseyite section of the English Church.

Q. In what Church did these admitted saints live and die?

A. In the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church.

Q. What do you conclude from this?

A. That as one can be sanctified through Christ in the Catholic Church, so he can certainly be saved in the same Church; and if he can be saved in this Church, it must be the true Church, and he can be saved in no other; for Christ did not establish two Churches. There is only *one baptism, one fold, one shepherd, one revelation*, containing *one true set of doctrines*.

Q. Did God ever work miracles to testify the sanctity of a Catholic?

A. Even enemies admit that he did. That he wrought miracles by the hand of St. Francis Xavier, is allowed by Baldeus, Hackluit, and Tavernier, all rigid Lutherans and Calvinists. Now, St. Francis was a Catholic Priest; and hence the Catholic religion, which, by the aid of these miracles, he taught and propagated, must be the true religion, since God could not give the testimony of his Almighty hand to error.

CHAP. VI.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Is *holiness* a mark of the Church?

A. Yes; and it is a very bad sign in any particular Church if it does not train up its members to be holy.

Q. What do you say to the character given to Protestant pastors by the Doc. Catechism, (p. 68)?

A. I could have gladly avoided drawing personal comparisons into this great discussion: they are painful to charity and modesty. Yet our adversaries raise this issue. Well, we will meet it. Perhaps this is but right, as our Lord has plainly given this rule. Two sets of teachers of religion now present to you their opposing claims, and the King of the Church says: "Beware of false prophets," (that is, teachers.) (What next "They are not in communion with the chair of Peter"? "They separate from the Church"? No; but—) "*Ye shall know them by their fruits.*"

Q. What then is the character of Protestant pastors?

A. We appeal to all candid men whether they are not pronounced by the best judges, *as a class*, the most truly useful, disinterested, spiritual, and *holy* men in the communities where they live.

Q. Are the pastors of the Roman Church remarkable for their purity and sanctity of life?

A. There have been among them at times, and we doubt not still are, some very virtuous and devout men, and we are not ambitious to imitate the presumptuous evil-speaking which has just been noticed. Yet faithfulness to our Lord's test of false teaching by its fruits, requires us to notice this *terrible fact*—that it is the general belief of the people where they are best known, that the priesthood of that Church, from Popes and Cardinals down, are *generally* covetous and lewd. They are indeed greatly to be pitied for this, because their enforced single life, together with their secret tyrannical power over their people, tempts them to be sensual. Thus, (as every body knows,) in Cuba and Mexico they are the chief patrons of the cock-pit. Thus, too, while

they profess to be too spiritual to have wives, they are often none too much so to keep concubines. These things are not done, at least openly, in this and other Protestant countries; for shame and decency suppress them. But wherever the Roman Church is predominant and alone, they are common and public.

Q. The pastors, however, are but a small part of a Church; how do the *lay people* compare in the Reformed and Roman Churches?

A. It is a notorious fact that on comparison of any two communities otherwise alike, but which are under the respective influence of the two churches, the Protestant community will be plainly the less vicious; for example, in Rhenish Prussia, by the census of 1855, of youthful criminals, among the Romish population there were 17 in every 1000, of the Protestants only 7. In proportion as the Roman Church controls the religion of any people, there are a very few severely devout persons, and the rest utterly worldly. These last may have a formal and even superstitious outward religion; or they may sneer at all piety while they comply with these forms from fear or habit; or they may be utterly neglectful of it all. The strongest instance of this is the Italian people (and especially *the Pope's own subjects, the Romans*, and those of Naples) who are confessedly the most unbelieving and vicious people in Europe.*

Q. In views of these facts, what say you of the superior "means and doctrines of holiness" claimed by the Roman Church?

They are evidently inferior to those of Protestants, though we were assured just now (p. 69) that these had "no means of holiness—*they have destroyed them all!*"—and that "holiness is incompatible with their immoral principles"!

* Here is a table carefully made up from the latest statistics, of the number of murders in a year to a million of the population in all the principal countries of Europe under the care of the Roman Church, compared with Protestant England:

Ireland,	19	Sardinia,	20
Belgium,	18	Lombardy,	45
France,	31	Tuscany,	56
Austria,	36	Sicily,	90
Bavaria,	68	Naples,	174
Pope's Dominions,			113
ENGLAND,			4

Q. What can be said of those persons who lived in the Dark Ages who are reckoned "saints" by the Roman Church?

A. Some of them evidently have no title to that honorable name;* while some others were very holy and wise persons, for those superstitious and ignorant times.

Q. Can the Roman Church claim any credit for the sanctity of these persons?

A. No; for we may well suppose that they would have been even better in times of more freedom and knowledge; as also that there would have been *many more* such. Instead of this, the greatest violence and profligacy prevailed, *as the general rule*, in the Church through all these ages.†

Q. Do *you* conclude that, since some have been sanctified and saved in the Roman Church, no one can be in any other?

A. By no means. The different churches in the world may be compared to ships making up the *fleet* of the universal Church, transporting men across the dangerous sea of life. Because *some* have crossed safely in the most leaky and dangerous vessel of all, *I* am not going to take passage in it in preference to one that is sound and safe, just because the crew of the leaky craft have the assurance and folly to say that theirs is the *only safe one*!

Q. What say you of the miracles wrought in that Church to prove its sanctity?

A. These are idle travellers' tales, unworthy of credit. Otherwise, why do they not now perform such wonders to confound the gainsaying of Protestants? *Which we challenge them to do.*

CHAP. VII.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What is the third mark of the true Church?

A. Catholicity or universality.

Q. Is this mark evidently required by Scripture?

* As "St. Charles," (Charlemagne,) who had several wives at a time.

† Fleury, Ecc. Hist. xv. 27, etc.

A. According to Scripture, the Catholic Church must be universal in three ways—universal as to *time*, universal as to *place*, and universal as to *doctrine*.

Q. Where do you find that she must be universal as to time?

A. In Isaiah 62 : 6 : "Upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, I have appointed watchmen all the day and all the night, they shall NEVER hold their peace." Isa. 9 : 7 : "Of the increase of his government and peace . . . there SHALL BE NO END." He shall sit upon the throne of David "to order it, and establish it, . . . from henceforth EVEN FOREVER." In John 14 : 16 : "I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete that he may abide with you *forever*."

Q. Where do you find universality, as to place, laid down in Scripture?

A. In Malachi 1 : 11 : "*From the rising of the sun to the going down thereof*, my name is great amongst the Gentiles." Ps. 21 : 28 : "*All the ends of the earth* shall remember, and shall be converted to the Lord." Ps. 2 : 8 : "Ask of me, and I will give *the Gentiles* for thine inheritance, and the *uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession*." Luke 24 : 46 : "That penance and remission of sins should be preached in his name *among all nations*." Acts 1 : 8 : "And ye shall be witnesses to me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and even to the *uttermost parts of the earth*."

Q. Is there any passage of Scripture, in which the above three kinds of universality are clearly laid down, as necessary qualities of the true Church?

A. Yes; in the commission given by Christ to his Apostles, Matt. 28 : 19, 20 : "Going, therefore, teach ye *all nations*; . . . teaching them to observe *all things*, whatsoever I have commanded you; and, behold, I am with you *all days, even to the consummation of the world*." Here you have, from the lips of Christ himself, an express attestation, that his Church will be Catholic or universal as to *time*, *place*, and *doctrine*.

Q. Is the Protestant Church universal in these three ways?

A. No; nor in any one of them. She is not universal as to time; for a few centuries back she had no existence; she is little more than three hundred years old.

A Church is composed of pastors and people, teaching and believing certain doctrines, and no such body holding Protestant doctrines was known in the world for fifteen hundred years after Christ left it. She is not universal either as to numbers or place; even the Greek Church is before her in numbers; and on this head she can not bear a comparison with the Catholic Church. According to the *Scientific Miscellany*, the total number of Protestants in the world is 48,985,000; the total number of Greeks is 56,360,000; whilst the number of Catholics is 254,655,000; that is, the Catholics are nearly six to one. But if we take each Protestant Church by itself, and this is the true point of comparison, (for these Protestant Churches all differ from one another,) we will find, then, that Catholics are to Presbyterians as sixty-five to one, and to the Church of England as thirty-six to one. Hence, it is not only incorrect, but ludicrous, to call any of these Protestant sects catholic or universal. Neither can they be called universal as to place; for Protestants are confined to a small corner of the earth, as will be evident, by the following statistical account, from the above authority:

	EUROPE.	ASIA.	AFRICA.
Catholics,.....	154,444,600	40,000,000	12,400,000
Protestants,....	39,675,000	50,000	10,000

	AMERICA.	OCEANICA.
Catholics,.....	34,110,000	3,450,000
Protestants,.....	9,150,000	50,000

These statistics are the most decisive proof that the Protestant is not the Church of all nations; she is not even the Church of any one nation, no, nor of even one parish exclusively on the face of the earth. In fine, she is not universal as to doctrine, either as to extent or truth; for she has taught, and does teach, many evident errors, such as predestination, the rejection of free will and good works, and the impossibility of keeping the commandments. And as to the teaching of all truth, she can have no pretension to it, since each Protestant sect has its *peculiar doctrines*; scarcely two of them have the same creed. They even rejected, as apocryphal, at one time, whole books of the sacred

Scripture, which they now admit—they reject to-day what they taught yesterday. Indeed, in point of doctrine, whether moral, dogmatical, or disciplinary, they present only one confused and revolting mass of contradictions, contrarieties, and absurdities.

Q. Is the Catholic Church universal in the above three ways?

A. No one will dare to deny that she is the Church of *all ages*. She is the only Church upon earth that can be visibly traced back through every age to the time of Christ. She is the Church of all nations, as is evident from the above statistical argument—there is not a Christian—nay, scarcely a Pagan—nation, that does not attest her actual presence, or, by noble monuments, her former greatness; her ancient canon law is still, in a great measure, the law of Scotland, as it is the foundation of the law of France, and the whole civil law of Europe and America; her noble temples and colleges, dedicated to the living God, are still the pride of England; the ruined monastic establishments and glorious cathedrals, that once adorned every country of Europe, have survived the Vandal hand of *barbarous reform*, as ever-enduring monuments, to perpetuate the history of Catholic greatness. Protestantism has never converted even *one* Pagan nation; whilst every people that have been brought to the knowledge and worship of the true God, professing that they owe their conversion to the Catholic Church, loudly proclaim her universality; *every where* her incense ascends; *every where* her sacraments are administered; *every where* her pure sacrifice is offered. To her alone did the Prophet speak, when he said: “I will give the nations for thine inheritance, and the ends of the earth for thy possession.” In fine, she is universal as to her doctrine; it is every where the *same*; it has, like the pure gold, passed through the ordeal of eighteen hundred years’ examination, unchangeable and unchanged; the combined efforts of heresy and infidelity against it have been unavailing. She teaches her children to observe *all* that God has commanded, and to believe *all* that he has revealed: her doctrine is, like her Divine founder, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.

Q. What says St. Augustine on the word Catholic?

A. "The very name of *Catholic*," he says, "keeps me in the Church. Heretics have done their utmost to obtain that name, yet they have never been able to succeed. If a stranger, on entering any city, were to ask, 'Where is the Catholic Church?' no heretic would dare to point out his heretical conventicle." (Tom. vi. Contra Ep. Fund. chap. 4.)

Q. Give us Saint Jerom's words, contra Lucif.

A. "When you see any body inherit its name from a particular man, as the Marcionites from Marcion, the Valentinians from Valentinus," (we may add the Lutherans from Luther, the Calvinists from Calvin,) "you may look on that body, not as the Church of Christ, but as the school of Antichrist."

Q. Give us a good reason why your name of Catholic is the best proof that you are in the true Church?

A. Those who remained in communion with the ancient body of the faithful retained the ancient name, whilst innovators gave to their followers either their own name, or one derived from their peculiarly novel doctrine, or from the country in which this new creed made its first appearance. Thus the Lutherans, the Calvinists, the Church of England, the Methodists, the Quakers, the Moravians, show, by their very names, the human origin of their religion.

Q. What inference do you draw from all that you have said on this mark of Catholicity?

A. That the Scripture expressly requires, in the true Church, universality as to *time*, *place*, and *doctrine*; that the Protestant Church is not universal in any of these three ways; that the Catholic Church is the only Church upon earth that has this triple universality, and, consequently, that it is the true Church of Christ.

CHAP. VII.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Is the Church of Christ Catholic or Universal?

A. We properly call the entire Church, Catholic or Universal; though, as these words mean *whole* or *entire*, to say that "the Church is Catholic," is no more than saying that *the whole Church is the whole Church*.

Q. Do the Scriptures say that the Church must be "universal in three ways, as to time, place, and doctrine"?

A. No; they do not use the term "universal" at all; and indeed that term can not properly apply to either of these things.

Q. What, then, according to plain common-sense, do the words of Scripture quoted (p. 74) by the Doctrinal Catechism, teach in regard to the Church?

A. 1st. That it shall endure forever, and 2d, that it shall extend through all the world. *Notice well* that this latter is a matter of *prophecy*, relating to the *future*, and can not be a necessary *present* mark of the Church. Otherwise the Church under the Apostles was not Catholic, for it certainly did not then extend through the whole world. This is made, if possible, yet plainer by the fact that neither the Roman Church nor any other was known in *America* before the Reformation.

Q. Does the Roman Church appear to be the whole Catholic Church in regard to *time* and *place*?

A. We have already seen (p. 66) that its being even a part of the Church is open to very grave doubts, which are aggravated by its exclusive claim to this. But passing by these, the fact that it is *that part* of the General Church in Europe which did not, at the time of the Reformation, return from the prevailing corruptions to the pure doctrine of Christ, is a strange proof of its being the only representative of the Church of the Apostles! The argument of numbers and place is unworthy of the Christian religion; as will appear from this alone, that the Roman Church itself must then yield to the Mohammedans and Pagans.

Q. But what can you say of the comparison made by the Doctrinal Catechism between the Roman and Reformed Churches, in regard to this?

A. 1st. Allowing all of the figures there given, it would be only as if the Northern States should claim to be the *whole* of this country because they have the most population. Nor is this made any better by taking any *one* Protestant communion for the comparison; for no one of these claims to be *the whole Church*: we leave that presumption to our adversaries. *Mark this well*, reader: the question is not, whether *they only* are Christians, or *we only*; but, whether *they only* are, or if others *also*, as Greeks, Protestants, Armenians, Copts, etc., may go to make up the Catholic Church of the world.

But, 2dly, let us examine these figures. And now we hear for the first time from the Doctrinal Catechism of a "*Greek Church*." NOTE WELL that you are now for the first time allowed to know of the existence of a Church *at least as old as that of Rome*, which has always rejected and denounced some of its doctrines—those doctrines which they say had always and every where been taught in the Church before the time of Luther!

The present numbers in the world are, according to the best authority, as follows:

Greek Church,	75,000,000	
Armenian and other Eastern,	10,000,000	
Reformed or Protestant,	95,000,000	
		180,000,000
Roman, (at the largest fair estimate,)		155,000,000

Thus it appears that the statement of the Doctrinal Catechism was grossly incorrect when made, or else that a great change is going on in our favor. Both these things are true in a measure. When we add to this, that in most of the countries where the Roman Church prevails, the people are not allowed to know any thing of the arguments on the other side; while people are Protestants when (yes, and *because*) they have full liberty to read, hear, speak, and think *on either side*, we shall see even better what force there is in this argument of numbers.

Q. Is there a real unity among all the Reformed Churches, notwithstanding their freedom of inquiry and opinion, and their differences in the less important matters of religion ?

A. There is such a living and loving unity of heart and mind that two devout Protestants of whatever communions, meeting one another for the first time on the other side of the globe, would feel such a cordial sympathy as could come only from "the love of God shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Ghost." This is seen in the good feeling between missionaries sent to the heathen by the various Reformed Churches ; and such a *unity of soul* is certainly far better than one which comes from a dead agreement of profession in every thing, enforced by severe human government.

Q. Do the Reformed Churches show themselves to be parts of the Universal or Catholic Church by laboring to extend it through all the world ?

A. Yes ; for (though we do not yet love our Master's glory enough) their missions are found on every continent and coast. They expend every year upon the conversion of the heathen *two* millions where the Roman Church does *one* ; and they have translated the Holy Scriptures into all the languages of the world, and given *one hundred* copies of them to the heathen where that Church has *one*. To mention a few of the results of the last fifty years ; the Sandwich Islands and New-Zealand are already Christian lands, and the great continents of Australia and India are steadily becoming so. On the other hand, the missions of which the Roman Church reported such success a century or more ago, and of which it still boasts loudly, are falling into ruin, and the nations they professed to have converted are as much Pagans as before.

Q. What of the remarks of Augustine and Jerome about the word "Catholic," quoted by the Doctrinal Catechism ?

A. These apply only to the use of that word in their time—1400 years ago and 300 years after the Apostles. We all know that the meaning of words changes in the course of ages. It is plain from the writings of these Fathers (*as we shall show by and by*) that they would have rejected with abhorrence many of the doctrines

of those who now claim to be the only Catholics. Besides, what they say is not to be obeyed absolutely like the Holy Scriptures, (in which indeed the word *Catholic* is not found at all,) as (St.) Augustine says himself.*

Q. Is it any argument that on the one side they commonly call themselves, and are often called by some others, "Catholics," while the others are more often mentioned as Lutherans, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists, etc.?

A. No; for we are not contending about *words*, but about great things. We are *Christians* in religion. Yet, if truly Christians, we are truly *Catholics*, as belonging to the General Church of Christ, and saying in the Creed, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church." Yet it is very convenient, and sometimes necessary, to mention the various Churches which make up the one Catholic body of Christ by appropriate names. Thus St. Paul wrote the Epistles to "the Romans," "the Corinthians," etc. Thus the Roman Church sometimes *calls itself* "the Roman Church"; and so those who adhere to it in France are known separately as "the Gallican (that is, French) Church." If to be called after some man's name makes one *no Catholic*, then the chief men of the Roman Church are no better off than the Lutherans; for they are called "Dominicans," "Franciscans," etc., according to their various "orders."

CHAP. VIII.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What is the fourth mark of the true Church?

A. Apostolicity.

Q. What do you mean by this word?

A. That any Church pretending to be the Church of Christ, must be able to trace her *doctrine*, her *orders*, and her *mission*, to the Apostles of Christ.

Q. Why should this be the cause?

A. Because, during all the time the Church has ex-

* See note on the right use of the Fathers, p. 40: also Aug. Op. ii. 747. Ep. ad Fort. iii.

isted, there must have been true pastors “for the work of the ministry, for the edification of the body of Christ”—Ephes. chap. 4. “Upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, I have appointed watchmen. . . . they shall never hold their peace.” (Isa. 62 : 6.) These pastors must have been lawfully sent; for “No man taketh the honor of the priesthood upon himself, but he that is called by God as Aaron was.” (Heb. 5 : 4.) Thus, Christ sent the Apostles; these Apostles sent others—for example, Paul and Barnabas; and again, Paul sent Timothy and Titus; and, in this manner, each succeeding generation of pastors was sent by the preceding from Christ to the present time; and the generation of pastors giving their commission to their successors, did it, by the power of Christ originally given, in these words: “As my Father hath sent me, I also send you.” In fine, the pastors of every age must have been ordained, according to that of St. Paul to Titus—chap. 1 : 5: “For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and shouldst *ordain priests in every city, as I also appointed thee.*”

Q. May it not be said that the Protestant Church is Apostolical in her doctrine, seeing that she adopts the Scripture as her rule?

A. If she were, all Protestants would teach the same truths; and surely no man in his senses will assert, that either the Apostles or the Scripture could teach all the contradictory and absurd creeds of Protestantism. Besides, for fourteen hundred years after the last of the Apostles left this world, Protestant doctrines were unknown amongst mankind.

Q. Is the Catholic Church Apostolic in her doctrine?

A. Even our adversaries admit this in spite of themselves; for whilst they unwittingly admit that we were the first Church, they as uniformly maintain that Popery is *unchangeable*. We teach the same doctrine now which was taught in every century and country since the time of Christ; our doctrines can not be traced to any man, or set of men, to any particular country, or date, posterior to the time of the Apostles; we defy our adversaries to trace it to any but Apostolic author-

ity. Besides, we are the only Church that has existed in *every* age, since the Apostolic times.

Q. Is not the Protestant Church Apostolic as to mission?

A. Certainly not; Luther was the first Protestant minister the world ever saw. By whom was he sent? Not by God; for he never wrought *one* miracle to prove it, and his life was such as to prove that he was sent by an *opposite authority*. Not by the Apostles; for he came fifteen hundred years too late to have any connection with them. Not by the Catholic Church; for she cut him off from her communion, and she could not give a commission to teach error directly opposed to her own creed. No Protestant Church existed prior to his time from which he could receive a commission; therefore he had no mission; therefore all his followers, in the heretical and schismatical body to which he gave being, are missionless intruders, who pay no regard to the words of St. Paul: "How shall they preach unless they be sent?" (Rom. 10.) Of such as they, the Almighty says, Jer. 23 : 21: "I have not *sent* these prophets, yet they ran: I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied." It is incumbent upon *them* to show that they are not the thieves and robbers mentioned by St. John, chap. 10.

Q. Is the Catholic Church Apostolic as to mission?

A. The Catholic Church alone, has, beyond all doubt, existed in every age, from the present till the Apostolic age. Hence, her pastors are the only pastors on earth, who can trace their mission from priest to bishop, and from bishop to Pope, back through every century, until they trace that mission to the Apostles, who were commissioned by Christ himself. We have a complete list of an uninterrupted chain of Roman Pontiffs, reaching from the present Pontiff, Pius the Ninth, to St. Peter. We have lists of all the Catholic sees in the world, and the names of the bishops who, in every age, occupied them; so that we have an unbroken succession of bishops ruling, teaching, and adorning every age and clime; all these in strict communion with the chief see, that of Rome.

Q. Is the Protestant Church Apostolic as to orders ?

A. The fact is, they have no orders at all, nor do many of them even pretend to have orders. The ministers of the various Calvinistic sects, as well as those of all other reformed sects not Lutheran, are mere laymen. The Lutherans, generally, can have no orders ; because they have never had a regular succession of *validly* ordained bishops, from whom they could receive orders. As to the orders of the Church of England, they are, to say the least, extremely doubtful ; because it has never been proved, that the *first Protestant bishop* of the Church of England was himself validly ordained or consecrated, and because the true form of ordination was not in use in the Church of England during one hundred and twelve years. But granting that they really are validly ordained, they have no *mission*, and hence they can be reputed only as so many suspended, schismatical, and heretical priests. In fine, as the whole fabric of Protestantism is only three hundred and thirty-two years old, it is manifest, that her ministers can not trace their orders to the Apostolic times.

Q. Are the orders of the Catholic priesthood Apostolic ?

A. They can be traced from priest to bishop, and from bishop to Pope, through every century back to the time of the Apostles. Indeed, a perpetual succession of Catholic pastors has always existed ; and hence, so little doubt is there even amongst Protestants on this subject, that the Church of England, by claiming her orders from us, clearly and unequivocally admits the Apostolicity of the orders of the Catholic Church.

Q. What inference do you draw from all this ?

A. That the Protestant Church is not, and the Catholic Church is, the true Church of Christ.

Q. Why this conclusion ?

A. According to Scripture, the true Church must derive, by a perpetual and uninterrupted succession from the Apostles, her *doctrines*, her *mission*, and her *orders* ; but the Protestant Church is not Apostolical in any of these ways—therefore she can not be the true Church. The Catholic Church, on the contrary, is evidently Apostolical in her doctrine, her orders,

and her mission—therefore she is the true Church of Christ.

Q. What general inference do you draw from all we have said on the marks of the Church?

A. That the Protestant Church has not even one of these Scriptural marks of truth; hence, her claim to be the Church of Christ, is ludicrous in the extreme; that, on the other hand, as we have seen, the Catholic Church evidently possesses them all—therefore she is the *one, holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church*.

CHAP. VIII.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Can that be a part of the Holy Catholic Church which is not *Apostolic*, in the sense of holding the chief doctrines of the Apostles, as written in the New Testament?

A. No.

Q. Is it necessary for the same, that any such Church should be *Apostolic* in this sense, namely, that it should be able to trace its succession of pastors to the Apostles?

A. If not absolutely necessary, (which it is not needed for us now to decide,) where pure doctrine and worship are maintained, it is surely most honorable and comforting to any Church in proportion as this appears true of it.

Q. Is the Protestant Episcopal Church Apostolic in these things?

A. In both. We invite a comparison of our belief and teachings with the Holy Writings. As to the authority of our bishops and other ministers, it has come down through the Church of England, in as plain a succession from the Apostles as any that the Church of Rome can show. The more candid and learned men of that Church admit this. The curses and excommunications which the Pope issued against the pastors of the English Church at the time, because they joined in the blessed Reformation, were of no effect to take away their "mission," because he had no rightful authority over them, (*as we shall prove by and by*.) In any case, to punish them for being faithful to the truth,

was not according to the will of the King of the Church, Jesus Christ our Lord, reigning in heaven, but against his laws and his glory, and so, *null and void in the Church*.

Q. Is the Roman Church Apostolic in its pastors ?

A. Their ministry, we believe, has been continued by regular ordination from the first times. Yet this is but a small thing unless they teach Apostolic *doctrine*. Caiaphas was the "successor" of Aaron, yet he murdered the Royal and Divine High Priest, Jesus. If a President were to usurp monarchical power in this country, and play the tyrant, he would be a sort of "successor" of Washington ; but would he, like him, deserve our reverence and obedience ?

Q. Is the Roman Church Apostolic in its doctrine ?

A. *Yes*, and *no*. It has always professed the chief doctrines of the Gospel, yet, with an inconsistency which is not uncommon in this world, it has long taught things contrary to those doctrines. Still the Doctrinal Catechism says: "We teach the same doctrine now which was taught in every century and country since the time of Christ," etc. *This is true of those doctrines which they hold in common with us Protestants, but false in regard to those which we reject*. I have read carefully all the writings which have come down to us from Christians who can be supposed to have personally known the Apostles ; and there is *not a trace* in them of the peculiar belief of the Roman Church. They are just such things as a wise and holy Protestant would write now. There are fourteen of these different writings by eminent bishops and others. It is not possible that such things could have then been known in the Church as a *Pope*, *Purgatory*, the *mass*, *transubstantiation*, the *invocation of saints*, the *adoration of images*, *secret confession to a priest*, *crucifixes*, *incense*, etc., without these first Christians speaking of them in some way. On the other hand, they do speak of *the wives of the clergy*, of confession to *God*, etc.

Following the history of the Church further, we find some faint beginnings of new doctrines about a hundred

years after the times of the Apostles: for instance, ascribing superior holiness to a single life, and magical power to the sacraments; and paying excessive honors to the memory of martyrs, and other holy men who had died. These errors gradually increased, and new ones were added, until the whole ripened fully in the Dark Ages, into that wonderful system of corrupt faith which the Roman Church even now maintains to be the pure Christian religion!* Here is one, among many proofs of this. We profess, and so do they, two "Creeds," called the "Apostles'," and the "Nicene," which were both made, at the farthest, within two hundred and fifty years of the Apostles. But they have *another*, of which we know nothing, containing all their peculiar doctrines, and called "the Creed of Pius IV." This was made *twelve hundred years later*, and LONG AFTER LUTHER WAS DEAD.

Q. Is it true, as declared in the Doctrinal Catechism, (page 83,) that the Roman Church is "the only Church that has existed in every age since the Apostolic times"?

A. If we were to allow their unreasonable claim, that the Reformed Churches are not *at least* as much as they, a part of that General Church, which has come down through all the ages; still this is a plain, willful falsehood, as the case of the *Greek Church* shows.

Q. Because we trace the succession of our pastors from the Apostles, through the ages when all the churches in Western Europe submitted to the power of the Bishop of Rome, as "Pope," do we owe any obedience to him?

A. No: for the other bishops and national Churches, whenever they became conscious of their rights, ought no longer to submit to this tyranny of the Pope, (obtained, as we shall see, gradually by fraud and force.) This was most true of the British Church, which, being first founded by the Apostles, or their immediate disciples, never had any thing to do with the Bishop of Rome for the first five hundred years.

* This is the "Popery" which has completed its system of errors, by declaring itself "unchangeable."

Rule of Faith.

CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Is it possible to be saved without divine faith ?

A. No : for St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. 11, says : “ Without faith, it is impossible to please God.”

Q. What two particular qualities must faith have, that it may be divine ?

A. It must be *firm and undoubting* ; and it must be PRUDENTLY *firm and undoubting*.

Q. Why firm and undoubting ?

A. Because, otherwise, it will not be divine faith, but mere *human* opinion. Divine faith is incompatible with doubt ; rather than call the smallest particle into doubt, we must be ready to lay down our lives ; for God, the author of faith, can not deceive.

Q. Why do you say that faith must be *prudently* firm ?

A. Because, no matter how strong and firm the inward conviction be, if it be irrational—that is, grounded on false reasoning—it is not a virtue, but rather the effect of a vicious, because willful, obstinacy ; such is the faith of the Turk, and the heretic of every sect.

Q. Where do you find the two above-mentioned conditions of divine faith ?

A. Only amongst Catholics ; because they only follow a rule of faith, which places the truth of their belief beyond the possibility of doubt.

Q. What is that which you here call a rule of faith ?

A. That which guides us to the belief and practice of all that God has revealed and commanded.

Q. What is the Catholic rule of faith ?

A. The whole Word of God, understood infallibly in its true sense.

Q. Is not the written Word of God alone a sufficient rule of faith ?

A. No : because it is susceptible of different senses, and the interpreter may give it a wrong sense. Hence,

that it may be to us an infallible rule of true faith, we must be absolutely certain that we understand the disputed passages correctly.

Q. Have Catholics on this head any certainty?

A. Their certainty is entire, because they receive from the Church, which they prove to be infallible, the exposition of the Scripture.

Q. Have not Protestants this same certainty?

A. No: for each Protestant explains the Scripture according to his own particular light, or fancy, or prejudice. Hence, he can never be certain that he is right, as he can never be absolutely certain that he is not deceived in his interpretation.

Q. What does St. Peter say to the faithful in his 2d Epistle, chap. 1?

A. That they should all understand, "That no prophecy of Scripture is made by *private interpretation*;" and after denouncing sects, and heresies, and crimes, in order to show that private interpretation is the cause of them, he adds, in the last chapter, that certain things in St. Paul's Epistles are hard to be understood: "Which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other Scriptures, to their own destruction."

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What is that "faith," without which "it is impossible to please" God?

A. It is not a mere *knowledge*, more or less complete, of what he has revealed to man; but a *trust* in him, by which we submit to his reproof, repent of our sins, humbly receive his free pardon, and devote our souls to the obedience and love of him.

Q. In order to this, must we not believe and profess what he has said?

A. We must do so from the heart, so far as we have learned this truth.

Q. Must this faith be "firm and undoubting"?

A. It is most safe and profitable to have it so; as, let us pray God that he would make it to be with us. Yet it is rash and dangerous to say, that there is *no faith* unless it is firm and undoubting. Our gracious Heavenly Father knows the weak doubts to which our souls are subject, and pities them. He commands his ministers: "Him that is *weak* in the faith *receive*."* "The bruised reed he will not break, nor quench the smoking flax."†

Q. Where has God revealed all that is important to our salvation?

A. In the Holy Writings (or Scriptures) of the Old and New Testaments.

Q. Are these plain enough to all who read them, or hear them read, so that no honest seeker, with this guide, need miss the way of eternal life?

A. Yes. It is unjust and ungrateful to the good God, to say otherwise. For however men may differ about less important doctrines, *that which is necessary to salvation* is there so plainly taught, that it is the *disobedient heart* alone that can not see it.

Q. Have members of the Roman Church greater security in this, because they claim to hear the Scriptures according to the "infallible interpretation" of their Church?

A. No: for words which are very plain of themselves need no "*interpretation*," which if it had any effect, would only confuse the meaning of them. Besides, 1st, Those who belong to that Church can not prove that their Church is "*infallible*," (that is, can not err;) 2dly, They can not agree among themselves, much less show to others, *who* is to *speak for* the Church in interpreting Scripture; and 3dly, under this supposed perfect "rule of faith," they do now in fact hold *great errors* in religion, as we have already seen, and will hereafter see more fully. On the other hand, the Reformed Churches, permitting every man to judge for himself

* Rom. 14: 1. "Him that is weak in faith take unto you."—Douay Bible.

† Matt. 12: 20. "The bruised reed he shall not break, and the smoking flax he shall not extinguish."—1b.

what God has written in his Word, do agree with one another, and with these Holy Scriptures in all matters necessary to salvation. We believe that the Church has authority in controversies of faith in this sense; that in deciding for ourselves, we allow great weight to its expressed judgment upon these things, as well as we can learn what that is. Yet we reserve to ourselves the *necessary right* to reject whatever the whole Church in the world should seem to teach, if it seemed to us plainly contrary to that which is the supreme law of the Church, that is, the written Word of God. This liberty of its private members is in fact the best human security that the Church will not utterly err.

Q. Is what is quoted by the Doctrinal Catechism from St. Peter, contrary to this?

A. No. In the first passage he is speaking of "prophecy," that is, of what is *foretold*; not of *doctrine*, or that which is *taught*. In the second he only says that some men, neglecting the plainest and most important parts of Scripture, will "wrest" or torture those parts which are more mysterious to countenance themselves in the neglect of true repentance and faith. Of course they can do this. It is a part of the free will which is allowed to all men; just as they can destroy themselves, if they choose, by wicked behavior; but in both cases they err willfully, and at their own peril.

Q. What was the belief of the first Christians about this?

A. They all said just what we say. For instance, (St.) Irenæus, 70 years after the Apostles: "The Holy Scriptures, both prophecies and gospels, are *plain* and *without doubtfulness*, and can be *heard alike by all men*."* (St.) Augustine, (two hundred years later :) "God in the Scripture speaks as a familiar friend to the hearts of *learned* and *unlearned*."† (St.) Chrysostom, (to the people :) "This I always urge, and shall never cease to urge, that you shall not only attend here to the things which are *said*, but also *at home* devote yourselves diligently to *the reading of the divine Scrip-*

* Adv. Hær. ii. 27.

† Op. ii. 611.

tures.”* I could give twenty such passages from the writings of these and others of the Fathers; and no man can produce *a single one* to the contrary.

CHAP. II.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Show us, more at length, why those who are not Catholics, can have no other than a doubting or vacillating faith?

A. It is, because there are three essential points, upon which they have no real certainty. In the first place, they have no real certainty as to the *canon of Scripture*; secondly, they can have none as regards their *versions or translations of Scripture*; and, thirdly, they can never be certain that their *interpretations are the genuine meaning of God's word*.

Q. Why can not Protestants know, with infallible certainty, what books of Scripture are canonical and divine?

A. Because they profess to believe nothing but what is expressly laid down in Scripture. Now the Scripture does not tell us what books are canonical; that is, what and how many books are God's divine word; this is admitted even by the most learned Protestants.

Q. Can not they know the books that are divine, by their excelling beauty and thrilling expression, as you know honey or sugar by their sweetness?

A. No; for if that could be, then all Protestants would have acknowledged the same books as canonical, and yet we know they have not agreed upon this point. The first Protestants rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse or Revelations, whilst the Protestants of the present day receive these books as divine. Calvin called the Epistle of St. James, an Epistle of gold, whilst Luther styled the same, an Epistle of straw.

Q. May they not say, that they know the canonical books by their titles?

A. If we must receive the Gospel of St. Matthew,

* Conc. de Laz. iii. 1.

because it bears his name, we should, for the same reason, receive the Gospels of St. Thomas and St. Bartholomew, because they bear the names of these Apostles, and yet all Christians reject these two Gospels as Apocryphal.

Q. May they not say, that they receive the true books of Scripture on the authority of tradition ?

A. No ; they reject tradition on every other question, as a doubtful source of truth ; hence, every doctrine drawn from it must be, for them, uncertain. Divine faith, they say, can not rest on tradition as a foundation ; if, therefore, they know what books are divine only from tradition, it evidently follows that they do not, and can not, believe these books to be God's word with divine faith.

Q. What happened at Strasbourg in the year 1598 ?

A. The Protestants expunged from their canon of Scripture, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of St. James, and the Apocalypse ; and seventy-four years after, they again replaced them. This fact may be seen in their old Ritual, in the chapter ON DOCTRINE, and in the new Ritual, page 7.

Q. What do you conclude from this ?

A. That they were all certainly wrong, either in expunging or receiving these books ; that if they were evidently wrong in a matter of such awful importance as is the integrity of the Scripture, they can have no certainty that they are right in any thing ; that, in fine, their faith resting thus, not upon any rational or certain foundation, but on the mere whims of men, can not be prudently firm, and, by a necessary consequence, can not be divine faith.

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. How do we know that the Holy Scriptures which we receive are the word of God ?

A. 1st. Because, by the general consent of the Christians of all ages, they have come down to us from the very Apostles, who proved by their miracles that God

had sent them; and, 2d, because, on comparison with all other writings they are of such wonderful excellence that none but God can be the author of them. Will those who speak for the Roman Church deny either of these facts?

Q. But the Scriptures themselves do not give a list of their books?

A. Of course not. There the books are, and they speak for themselves.

Q. But it is alleged that some of the leaders of the Reformation in Germany differed about the authority of some of these books?

A. The Church of England never did hesitate in its judgment; and all the other Reformed Communions soon, upon fair inquiry, settled down to the same decision. So that for two hundred years past *all Protestant Christians throughout the world* have been of one mind in this.

CHAP. III.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Why have you said, that those who are not Catholics, can never be certain that their translations from the original Scriptures are correct or faithful?

A. Because few, if any of them, understand the original languages; so that they are incapable of judging whether their translations are conformable to the originals.

Q. May they not reply, that they have every necessary security from their translators, whose knowledge of Greek and Hebrew was indisputable?

A. No; for these translators have given very different and contradictory versions; and how, in this case, are men of ordinary education to know which to adopt?

Q. What did Zwinglius say of Luther's translation of the New Testament?

A. He said, that Luther had corrupted the Word of God.

Q. What said Luther of that of Zwinglius?

A. He called it the work of fools, asses, and Antichrists.

Q. Did Beza give an opinion on the version of Ecolampadius, published at Bale?

A. Yes; he declared it impious, and opposed to the Spirit of God. The English declared the version of Geneva, the worst and the most unfaithful that had appeared.

Q. What does does Luther himself avow as regards translations of Scripture?

A. That he had added the word "ONLY" to the text of St. Paul, (chap. 3 to the Rom.,) for "we account a man to be justified by faith," he has, "by faith ONLY."

Q. How did he justify himself when reproached with this? (Tom. iii. Edit. de Jena, pp. 141, 144.)

A. "I know well," he says, "that the word *only* is not to be found in the text of St. Paul; but if any Papist plague you on the subject, tell him at once, that it was the will of Dr. Martin Luther that it should be added: and please to say further, that a Papist and an ass are one and the same thing." "*I am sorry*," says he, in addition, "that I have not *added other words*. This word 'ONLY' will remain in *my* New Testament, until all the Papists burst themselves with spite."

Q. What do you conclude from this?

A. That no prudent man can have any confidence in a Protestant Bible, since he can never be certain that it is properly translated. The English versions are of the same stamp with the German. (See D'Israeli's *Curiosities of Literature*, Edit. 1843, vol. iii. p. 530, et seq.) Hence, Butler (*Hudibras*) says:

"Religion spawned a various rout,
Of petulant, capricious sects,
The maggots of corrupted texts."

Q. Can you draw any further inference?

A. Yes; that the faith of Protestants, grounded as it is on *doubtful* versions of Scripture, is not prudently firm, and, consequently, is not divine.

Q. But have the Catholics themselves an absolute certainty as to the number of the sacred books, and the truth of the translations from them?

A. Yes; the Catholics are perfectly certain as regards

both points. The Church points out the books that are canonical, and the correct versions of these books. Now, a fundamental principle of the Catholic religion is, that the Church is infallible; because Christ says: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against her; that he will be with her all days; that his holy Spirit will teach her all truth forever." Hence the Catholic grounds his faith on what is *certainly* God's word; and his faith, consequently, is certainly divine.

CHAP. III.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Can we trust the translations of the Holy Scriptures from the original Hebrew and Greek which we have?

A. Yes; God has written his book so plainly that the most unfair and impudent translator could not render it into another language so falsely that all things necessary to salvation would not shine through his words.* Besides, it is one of the benefits of the glorious liberty of private judgment with which our Lord has made us free, that no man or men dare very greatly to falsify these words for fear of the general infamy which it would bring upon them.

Q. Do the translations in use among the Reformed Churches agree with one another?

A. There is a wonderful agreement among them in all important things: the differences are few and slight. But all candid persons join in admiring and praising the *English* Bible, as, though probably not without some trifling errors, the most faithful, plain, and beautiful translation in the world. We, in whose native language it is, ought to be most thankful to our Lord by whose kind providence we have thus been favored in the use of his holy word.

Q. What of the words about different translations put into the mouths of Luther, Zwingli, and others, by the Doctrinal Catechism?

* The way in which the Douay Bible agrees with ours in the passages which I quote, notwithstanding the labor of those translators to make its words favor the doctrines of the Roman Church, is a wonderful instance of this.

A. It is no part of our religion that these men never said any thing but what was wise and true, that is, were infallible. All this is unworthy of the great and serious controversy whether the Roman Church does not hold false doctrine. Can you trust the safety of your soul to this kind of reasoning? "Luther, etc., said so and so; therefore I can not find the word of God in the English Bible, and therefore also the Roman Church teaches the pure doctrine of that book."* (Even worse still perhaps is the vulgar levity of quoting on the next page from a ludicrous English poet to throw light on this controversy!)

Q. Have members of the Roman Church any other evidence of the number of the sacred books and of the truth of translations than we have?

A. None whatever. The pretended proof of that is only a deceitful *reasoning in a circle*. Here it is: "We know that this is the Book of God because the Church says so, and the Church is *infallible*. We know that the Church is infallible because Christ said that the gates of hell should not prevail against it.† We know that Christ said so, because *it is in the Book of God*, and we know that this is the book of God *because the Church says so*, AND THE CHURCH IS INFALLIBLE;" and so forth round and round.‡

* It may be well enough to remark that Luther's use of the word "only" in his translation, was, of course, to make what he supposed the real meaning of the Greek plainer in the German. Every scholar understands this.

† There is here another specimen of the same false reasoning, which I passed by above: "We know that he meant by this that the Church is infallible, because the Church says so, AND THE CHURCH IS INFALLIBLE."

‡ You see that in this way any body can prove any thing. For instance the Mohammedans can prove their religion true. Thus, "We know that the Koran is true, because Mohammed was inspired by God to write it; and we know that Mohammed was inspired by God to write the Koran because the Koran says so, etc., etc. But after all that the Doctrinal Catechism has said, would any body suppose that *no translation at all* into any living language, has the authority of the Roman Church? Yet such is the fact. For instance, if I were to find some mistake in their English Bible, they would tell me that their Church was not responsible for this mistake, as the translation had never been approved by a Pope and Council, which is a fact. Yet the Doctrinal Catechism says that their members have an absolute certainty of the truth of these translations because the Church points them out!

CHAP. IV.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Why have you said that Protestants have no certainty or security as regards the true sense of the Scripture ?

A. The passages of Scripture which regard controverted points, may be tortured into two different, and sometimes opposite meanings ; now the Scripture itself does not, and can not, tell us which is the true sense.

Q. Have not Protestants said, that they are *individually inspired* to understand, in its true sense, any passage of Scripture ?

A. Yes ; but they have said many very absurd things. According to this blasphemous assertion, it was the Spirit of God who taught Luther the *real* presence, while the same spirit taught Calvin the *figurative* presence ; it is God who inspires the Church of England to have bishops, and the Church of Scotland to reject them ; one sect of Protestants to admit good works as necessary to salvation, and another sect to reject them ; one minister to account baptism necessary to salvation, and another to repute it as a mere ceremony. Surely, if they were inspired, they would all believe the same set of doctrines.

Q. May they not say, that the ambiguous texts are easily explained by those that are clear ?

A. Yes ; they may say any thing ; but it so happens, that each flatters himself, that the texts which appear to support his peculiar notions are abundantly clear. Thus, to prove that *Christ is not God*, the Unitarians think these words, "*My Father is greater than I ;*" and these other, "*That Christ is the first-born of creatures,*" very clear indeed. The Presbyterians, to prove that the Sacrament is only bread and wine, think these words, "*The flesh profiteth nothing, the words which I speak to you are spirit and life,*" the clearest portion of Scripture ; as if any Christian in his senses could believe, that the flesh of Christ, by which, in union with the Divinity, the world was redeemed, profited nothing. The Anabaptists, to prove that infants should not be baptized, bring forward, what they ima-

gine is very clear, these words: "TEACH *all nations, baptizing them:*" and, "*he who BELIEVETH and is baptized shall be saved.*"

Q. Do other Christians think these clear also?

A. Yes; some think them very clear in proving the opposite doctrines, and others think them the most obscure passages in the Inspired Volume.

Q. Do these sects quote other texts to prove their peculiar notions?

A. Yes; they will quote texts by the dozen, to prove any doctrine you please. It is quite clear to the Free Kirk of Scotland, from Scripture, that the Established Kirk is Antichrist; and to the latter, the Scripture as clearly proves the Free Church to be schismatical. To some, Joanna Southcote was the mother of the Messiah; to some of the followers of Wesley, the greatest crimes are only spots upon God's children; whilst to the Muckers of Prussia, immorality is virtue.

Q. What inference would you draw from all this?

A. That a wise God must have left in his Church some judge perfectly qualified to decide, authoritatively, on all religious disputes, and to point out, with certainty, the true sense of the Inspired Volume.

Q. Enforce this truth by a comparison?

A. As a legal process could never be terminated, if the counsel were allowed to appeal merely to the book containing the law, so religious disputes can never be settled by an appeal merely to the Scriptures; and as a lawfully commissioned judge is necessary for the settlement of civil matters, so is a divinely-appointed judge necessary for the decision of the more difficult and more important matter of religion.

Q. Who is that judge?

A. The *teaching* body of the Church of Christ, whom he sent to preach his Gospel to all nations, and to whom he promised the continued guidance of his Spirit, even to the end of time.

Q. What do you understand here by the teaching body of the Church?

A. I understand, not the Pope alone, nor the bishops

alone, either severally or collectively, but the Pope, with the bishops *as a body*; and not every or any body calling himself bishop, but those only who are in communion with the See of Rome.

CHAP. IV.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Need we err in learning all that is necessary for salvation from the Holy Scriptures, because men can "*torture*" some of its words into opposite meanings?

A. No; for honest common-sense will not attempt to torture it.

Q. Do Protestants claim to be "inspired" (see p. 98) to understand the Scriptures?

A. No; if by this is meant any special favor from God by which they can understand all of his truth without any mistake. Yet *he* blasphemes who contradicts these words of God: "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth liberally to all men and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him."* Whoever then, when reading the Scriptures, humbly *prays* that he may understand them, will not seriously "err therein."

Q. What can you say of the contradictory doctrines of Protestants which the Doctrinal Catechism professes to cite (p. 98)?

A. Such of these as are not falsely ascribed to them are not matters necessary to salvation, except what is said of the persons called "Unitarians," who of course are no Christians at all, but a sort of Deists.†

* Jas. 1:5: "But if any of you want wisdom, let him ask of God who giveth to all men abundantly and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him."—Douay Bible.

† It is a wonderful fact in the grace of God, that among those who do thus "deny the Lord that bought them," there are sometimes found persons who seem to be humble and devout. This is perhaps due to the fact that there are all shades of opinion among those who thus depart from true religion; some of them even professing almost the Christian faith. We must acquit this writer of falsehood in reckoning Joanna Southcote and the Muckers among the Protestants, by ascribing this mistake to his great ignorance of the Reformed doctrine.

Q. Does it appear necessary, in order that men may not fail to understand the great salvation taught in the Gospel, that there should be some infallible persons upon earth to decide all controversies?

A. No ; it seems more like God's just government of the free will of men, that his plain word should be given to each man, and he then left to his free choice, whether he will use it for his salvation, or "wrest it to his destruction," as he will answer at the day of judgment.

Q. Is such a human judge needed for the word of God as is needed to decide and enforce human law?

A. No ; for in that case it is a dispute between men about some property, or about the guilt and punishment of a certain man ; and some judge is needed to pronounce upon this. Whereas, the other is a matter strictly between each man's *conscience* and *God*. There *is* a judge in that case, *God himself* ; and no *man* should presume to interfere in it, as judge.

Q. But even supposing that such a human judge of the Scriptures was needed, what *proof* does the "Doctrinal Catechism" give, that the "teaching body" of the Roman Church is that judge?

A. NONE WHATEVER. It simply declares so, and expects me, if I have been persuaded by its false reasoning so far, to believe *this* without any pretense of reasoning whatever. It does not here even venture that ridiculous quotation : "Hear the Church."

CHAP. V.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What are the qualities of the Catholic rule of faith?

A. The Catholic rule is UNIVERSAL, CERTAIN, and CLEAR OR EASY.

Q. Why *universal*?

A. It is a rule for all, the learned as well as the ignorant ; it relieves the former of all doubt and uncertainty, and spares the latter the trouble of a difficult inquiry and examination, for which they are in no way qualified.

Q. Why do you say it is *certain*?

A. Because it is no other than the word of God, explained by God's appointed organs, in the very sense intended by the Holy Spirit, and of course God can neither deceive nor be deceived.

Q. Why do you say it is clear?

A. Because it tells clearly, in what sense all ambiguous portions of God's word are to be understood.

Q. What are the peculiar advantages of the Catholic rule of faith?

A. In the first place, it *banishes all doubt*; secondly, it *decides finally every dispute*; thirdly, it *preserves unity*. When an infallible judge decides, there can be no room for doubt or division.

Q. What say you of those who would examine, *personally*, every controversial point, and abide by what, *they in their wisdom think*, the Scripture teaches?

A. That they adopt a rule which, for the great mass of mankind, is an impossibility; because, to form a proper judgment from the Scripture on any controverted point, one should know, in the first place, all the texts of Scripture that are for or against such point; secondly, it would be necessary to compare these texts, one with the other, to weigh their respective force, to illustrate the obscure by others more clear: thirdly, to be absolutely certain, that *all* of them are understood in their *true sense* and no other. Now, this is evidently a business far beyond the reach, at all events, of the ignorant, who form the great mass of mankind.

Q. But may not the learned aid the ignorant in this inquiry?

A. Such is the absurdity to which error always reduces its votaries. You refuse to submit to the decision of the *whole Church*—to the decision of *all the learned, pious, and enlightened prelates of the Church*, with the sovereign Pontiff at their head, men of all others the best qualified to judge of religious matters; you reject their opinion, whilst you would blindly follow the crude notions of *one* layman pretending to learning, of one Calvinistic or Lutheran minister, for the truth of whose opinions you have no security whatever.

CHAP. V.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What say you, then, to this "rule of faith" of the Roman Church?

A. It is false, dangerous, and tyrannical.

Q. Why is it false?

A. Because it is not to be found in the Holy Scriptures themselves, but is contrary to them. They call upon me to read, hear, and judge for myself, but they *no where* tell me to believe all and only what "the teaching body of the Church" says. *Nor is there any other sort of PROOF* that God has commanded this. What puts this thing beyond doubt is, that no such notion was heard of among Christians for several hundred years after the Apostles. Remember what I have already quoted (p. 91) from Irenæus, Augustine, and Chrysostom. The latter also says: "This is *the cause of all ill, that the Scriptures are not known.*"* (St.) Jerome says: "'Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly.' Here we are taught that *the lay people* ought to have the word of God not only sufficiently, but also with abundance, and to *teach and counsel one another.*"† So also again, Augustine writing against the "Donatists," who denied that any body but them belonged to the true Church, says: "Let us not hear, 'You say that, I say this,' but let us hear, 'Thus saith the Lord.' There are surely *books of the Lord*, to the authority of which we both consent, we both yield, we both obey. *There let us seek the Church.* Therefore let us *seek the Church in the Holy Canonical Scriptures.*"‡

Q. Why is it dangerous?

A. Because if the greater part of the teaching body *does* mistake in any thing, there is no getting back to the right.§ For if any or all of the people, or even

* Hom. ix. in Ep. to Col. † In iii. cap. Ep. ad Col. ‡ Op. ix. 340.

§ To put beyond all question that this *has actually happened*, especially in the Latin (or Roman) Church, I quote from (St.) Vincent of Lerins, a high authority in that Church: "The Arian heresy had in a manner infected *the whole Christian world*, and almost all the bishops of the LATIN CHURCH, partly by fraud and partly by force, had gone into the delusion." (Com. ch. ii.) Among them was Liberius, *Bishop of Rome!*

nearly half of the bishops, should see the mistake and show however plainly that it was contrary to the Scriptures, they would simply be voted down and told by the other side that they must understand the Scriptures according to what *they* said was the true meaning, that is, in accordance with the false doctrine. Thus the Church never would retrace a false step, but must go on from one error to another, as was seen in the Dark Ages. So that, if I adhere to this "rule of faith," and follow all that is taught under it, there is *no remedy* for any false ways it may lead me into; as there always is, where freedom of inquiry into the written word of God, and conscientious judgment, is allowed to each soul.

Q. Why is it *tyrannical*?

A. Because in effect it would make me the abject slave in opinion of my own parish priest. For suppose he teaches me something which I do not think the true doctrine of the Church. I must then either give up my opinion for his, or appeal to the bishop over him, and if I am not yet satisfied, then to the Pope, and "not the Pope alone" either, but "the Pope with the bishops as a body." And how can I know what they decide? Will they be summoned from all parts of the world to answer every such appeal that any member of the Church may make to them? Or will they write their answers to me? And if this is possible for any, *how many* members of the Church have time and money to carry on such appeals? Besides, *what shall I believe in the mean time*—my own "private judgment," or what I think the false doctrine of the priest?

But if it should be said that there are *books* which contain the opinions of "the Fathers" and the decrees of Councils, giving the decision of the whole Church; how many have money and time to search in these books of many hundred volumes, scarcely any of which have ever been translated from the dead languages? Then, too, we are told that the book of God is so obscure, that we can not find the way to be saved by an honest reading of it, but must go to these *books of men* to be safe! What then is the use of the book of God at all?

The poor man (indeed, nearly, if not quite, *every* man) is thus made the blind slave of his priest. How then can he have "a prudently firm and undoubting faith" in the doctrines he is taught, when he thinks that, perhaps, if he had money to carry an appeal from his priest to a Pope and Council, these doctrines might be declared false?

Q. Is this rule a safer one than that of Protestants, as being "more universal, certain, or clear, and easy"?

A. No; for the written word of God is plain enough in all things necessary to salvation for the honest judgment of all sorts of men, and it, and *it alone*, can not possibly teach false doctrine. If the other "banishes all doubt," it also banishes all really *free* and *reasonable* belief. If it "decides finally every dispute," it decides many *the wrong way*; and if it "preserves unity," it is the union of error and slavery.

Q. In using this right and duty of private judgment, need we pay no regard to what the wisest and best men in the Church say?

A. By no means. We should honestly use all such things to assist our judgment; but after all we *must judge for ourselves*. We can be wise and modest without being blind and slavish.

Q. *Must* every one NECESSARILY rest his religious belief upon his "private judgment"?

A. Yes; for even the obedient member of the Roman Church *decides for himself* that his is the true rule of faith. *Otherwise he should now at once abandon it.*

CHAP. VI.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Has tradition any connection with the rule of faith?

A. Yes; because it is a part of God's revealed word, properly called the *unwritten* word, as the Scripture is called the *written* word.

Q. What is tradition?

A. The doctrines which the Apostles taught by word of mouth, and which have descended through every successive generation even to our times.

Q. Are we obliged to believe what tradition teaches, equally with what is taught by Scripture ?

A. Yes ; we are obliged to believe the one as firmly as the other ; because, what the Apostles *preached* is as true as what they *wrote* : it was the same Holy Spirit who spoke by their mouths and by their pen.

Q. Repeat the words of St. Paul. 2d Thess. 2 : 14.

A. "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the TRADITIONS which you have learned, whether by word or by our Epistle." (See, also, 2 Thess. 3 : 6 ; 1 Cor. 11 : 2 ; 2 Tim. 2 : 3.)

Q. Do the Protestants believe many things not clearly laid down in Scripture ?

A. Yes ; they believe many things essentially necessary to salvation, which are not contained in Scripture.

Q. Mention a few of them.

A. The Scripture does not any where say, that all the books composing itself are the Word of God ; it can not tell us, whether our copies of it are correct ; whether our translations from these are faithful ; whether the books of Scripture that are lost are a necessary part of the rule of faith ; it does not tell us whether *infants* should be baptized ; whether the obligation of keeping Saturday holy has been done away with ; whether Sunday should be kept in its place, or at what hour the day of rest should commence and terminate ; all these, and *twenty-four other necessary points*, are not clearly laid down in the Sacred Volume.

Q. What says St. Epiphanius on this subject, 91, Heresy ?

A. That every necessary thing is not to be found in the Scripture ; for the doctrines of the Apostles were not all committed to writing—many of them, delivered by word of mouth, were handed down by tradition ; indeed, many of the Apostles wrote nothing.

CHAP. VI.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What is a *tradition*?

A. Any thing *delivered* or *handed down*. For instance, whatever God has revealed to men by the mouths of his Prophets and Apostles, or by the Holy Writings. So, also, *these very Writings*, (or Scriptures,) passed down from one generation to another, are *traditions*.* We may also so style the general understanding which the first Christians had of the Gospel. This having come down to us in their writings, helps us to maintain its plain meaning against those who would change it.

Q. Have we any reason to think that the Apostles and Evangelists failed to leave behind them *in the Holy Scriptures* all such things revealed to them by God as are necessary to salvation?

A. NONE WHATEVER; the written Word being so much plainer and safer than any thing passed from one age to another merely by word of mouth.

Q. What does St. Paul mean by *traditions*, in 2 Thess. 2 : 14?

A. He means whatever he taught by inspiration of God, whether in writing or speech. But when he died he left all these necessary truths in his *then completed writings*. We can not doubt this, *for so the Church then understood it*. The early Christian writers always prove their doctrine by these *writings*, and *never speak of an "unwritten Word of God."* So, (St.) Ambrose: "All truth is in the New Testament."† (St.) Jerome: "But other things which men find, or invent, without the authority and testimony of Scriptures, *as if from APOSTOLICAL TRADITION*, the sword of the Lord smites through."‡ (St.) Cyril: "Let us speak *only those things which are written*; if any thing be not written, let us not curiously seek to know it. The Holy Spirit himself has uttered the Scriptures.§ He

* This is plainly one sort of tradition in St. Paul's meaning, when he says: "The traditions which you have learned, whether by word or our epistle."

† Op. i. 1206, in Ps. 118.

‡ Op. vi. 749, in i. Aggai.

§ That is literally, "The Writings."

has said whatever he chose concerning himself and all that we were able to receive. Let us speak, therefore, those things which are dictated by himself; for what he has not said we dare not.”*

Q. It appears, then, plain, that the notion of an “unwritten” law of God by tradition in matters necessary to salvation, is false; but is it a *harmless* or a *dangerous* error?

A. Most dangerous; for by this those truths on which depends the soul’s salvation, might be easily changed and corrupted. Our Lord has evidently warned us against this by the example of the Pharisees, who thus added to the written law of Moses, saying to them: “Thus ye have made the commandment of God of none effect by your traditions.”†

Q. What do you say of the things mentioned in the Doctrinal Catechism, (page 106,) as held by Protestants to be “necessary to salvation,” though not found in the Scriptures; and of the “twenty-four other things” which it does not find it convenient to enumerate?

A. The Reformed Churches do not hold any of these things to be essential to that union of the soul of man with our Lord Jesus Christ by faith and love, which is necessary in order to be saved.



Do we find that Protestants really adhere to the Scriptures as their only Rule of Faith?

CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What is the doctrine of Protestants regarding the commandments of God?

A. They teach that it is impossible to keep them. “No mere man,” say they, “since the fall, is able perfectly to keep the commandments of God.”

* Cat. de Spir. Sanct. 16.

† Mark 7: 13. “Making void the word of God by your own *tradition*, which you have given forth.”—Douay Bible.

Q. What says our Saviour on this subject, in the 11th chapter of St. Matthew?

A. "My yoke is *sweet*, and my burden is *light*."

Q. What says the Gospel of St. Luke 1 : 6, speaking of Zachary and Elizabeth?

A. "And they were *both just before God, walking in ALL the commandments and justifications of the Lord, WITHOUT BLAME.*" St. John, in his first Epistle 5 : 3, says: "For this is the charity of God, that *we keep his commandments*, and his commandments are not *heavy*." In Deut. 30 we have: "This commandment that I command thee this day, is not *above thee*, . . . but in thy mouth and in thy heart *that thou mayest do it.*"

Q. Could a wise God give to his children commandments that he knew they were unable to observe?

A. Certainly not; for even a master, who would order his slave to carry a burden beyond his strength, would be reputed a fool. Besides, did not the young man in the Scriptures tell Christ himself, that he had kept all the commandments from his youth? and Christ, who knew his heart, did not contradict him, but urged him to other and greater works of love.

Q. Do you find from these passages, that the law of God *can not* be observed?

No; I find quite the contrary. Protestants, therefore, follow any thing or every thing but Scripture in this matter; their empty boasting about what they call their *Scriptural* religion, is only a grossly fraudulent means to conceal their errors—to catch the simple and ignorant—and to throw the more learned off their guard.

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What has God said to us in his Holy Word about our sinfulness?

A. "There is no man that sinneth not."* "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves:"† and this

* 1 Kings 8 : 47. So also the Douay Bible.

† 1 John 1 : 8. So also the Douay Bible.

prayer which our Lord teaches *all men* to pray : " Forgive us our sins."*

Q. What must we say of those who hold this truth, and of those who reproach them with it ?

A. That the Reformed Churches, in teaching faithfully that every soul of man is lost in sin, and so needs the Divine Saviour, show that they have come down in right succession from the Lord and his Apostles ; while those who deny this, act upon the side of that Evil One whose works the Son of God came to destroy.

Q. Is this truth of the sinfulness of all men contradicted by the fact, that some are commended in the Scriptures for piety ; or by the evident truth, that God would not command us to do what we were not able to do ?

A. No ; for the praises there bestowed are to be taken in a qualified manner, in agreement with this sad *fact*, that all men *are* sinners. These persons were, by God's grace, blameless in the general spirit and conduct of their lives ; yet they doubtless had some sins to ask forgiveness for. So, also, God exacts nothing of us but what is just ; but in fact we *will not* do what he commands. The yoke of Christ "*is easy* ;" but men perversely shun it. Yet we are not called upon to argue these things here ; we assume that we are disputing not with *infidels*, who captiously complain of inconsistencies in the Word of God, but with those who revere and believe it all.

CHAP. II.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What is the doctrine of Protestants on the subject of faith ?

A. They teach that *faith alone justifies* the sinner.

Q. What does St. James say, chap 2 : 17, and following ?

A. " So faith also, if it have not works, is dead in itself, even the devils also *believe* and tremble." " Was not Abraham our father *justified* by works, offering up Isaac his son upon the altar ?" " Do you see that man is *justified* by *works*, and not by *faith*

* Luke 11 : 4. So also the Douay Bible.

only ?" St. Paul, 1 Cor. 13, says : " And if I should have *all faith*, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing." Our Saviour addresses Magdalen thus : " Many sins are forgiven thee, because thou hast loved much."

Q. What do these texts clearly prove ?

A. That the Protestant doctrine is false—that their creed is in direct opposition to their own boasted rule of faith.

Q. What is the Protestant doctrine touching good works ?

A. They teach that good works are not at all necessary to salvation.

Q. What does our Saviour teach on the same subject ? Matt. 10 : 17.

A. That we can not enter into heaven without good works : " If you would enter into life, keep the commandments." St. James 2 : 17, says : " So, faith, if it have not works, is dead in itself." St. Paul teaches, Rom. 2 : 13, that " not the *hearers* of the law are *just* before God, but the *doers* of the law shall be *justified*." In 2 Peter 1 : 10, we are told : " Wherefore, brethren, labor the more, that by GOOD WORKS you make sure your calling and election." Jesus Christ himself says, Matt. 7 : 21 : " Not every one that sayeth to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that *doeth* the will of my Father who is in heaven, he shall enter into the kingdom of heaven."

Q. What is the reason to be given by Christ on the last day, why he shall pronounce the sentence of eternal exile on many of the wicked ? is it only that they had no faith ?

A. No : it is that they had no charity. Matt. 25 : 41 : " Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, . . . for I was hungry, and *you gave me not to eat* ; I was thirsty, and *you gave me not to drink* ; I was a stranger, and *you took me not in* ; naked, and *you covered me not* ; sick, and in prison, and *you did not visit me*."

Q. What think you now ? Is the Protestant doctrine on good works in accordance with Scripture ?

A. No, certainly ; on the contrary, it seems invented to set Scripture and reason at defiance. It is evidently opposed both to the spirit and the letter of the Word of God.

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What has God told us of how we sinners may obtain pardon, and thus become, and remain his beloved children?

A. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved."* "For by grace are ye saved *through faith*, and that not of yourselves, *it is the gift of God: not of works*, lest any man should boast;"† and many other like passages. From these words it is plain, that we can not *merit* this pardon; but we can *trust* in the free mercy of God, offering it to us through the atonement of our Saviour. When we *have* this honest faith we submit ourselves to Christ Jesus, the Lord, repent of sin, and devote ourselves to love and serve him for all the rest of our lives. Thus we are "justified by faith."

Q. Is this contrary to what is said by St. James about good works?"

A. No: for we mean a living and loving faith in Jesus Christ, which is followed by "works," and not a dead faith, which is no more than an opinion. Such is the doctrine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, as written in the XIIth Article of Religion, as follows: "Albeit, that Good Works which are the fruits of Faith, and follow after Justification, can not put away our sins and endure the severity of God's judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively Faith; insomuch, that by them a lively Faith may be as evidently known as a tree discovered by the fruit." We therefore believe, that he who does not honestly seek to do good works, *proves by this* that he has not that faith by which we are justified, and so can not be saved.

Q. Does this "Protestant doctrine" seem to you "invented to set Scripture and reason at defiance"?

* Acts 16: 31. "Believe on the Lord Jesus and thou shalt be saved."—Douay Bible.

† Eph. 2: 8, 9. "For by grace you are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, for it is the gift of God; not of works, that no man may glory."—Douay Bible.

A. On the contrary, this alone satisfies and unites them, showing how God can "be just and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus."* They, however, who reject it, have serious reason to consider whether they understand the true remission of sins, and are in the way to be saved: whether they may not be like some whom St. Paul describes, with "a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge," who, "being ignorant of God's righteousness, (or justification,) and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God."† With most affectionate concern, I invite you to think well of this.

CHAP. III.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What is the Protestant doctrine on assurance, or the certainty of grace?

A. They pretend, that the moment *we believe in Jesus Christ*, we are infallibly assured of God's grace.

Q. What are we taught in Eccles. 9 : 1, 12 ?

A. "Their just men," says that inspired book, "and wise men, and their works, are in the hand of God, and yet man *knoweth not* whether he be worthy of love or hatred, but *all things* are kept *uncertain* for the time to come; man knoweth not his own end." Solomon, Proverbs 20 : 9, asks: "Who can say: *my heart is clean, I am pure from sin?*" St. Paul to the Phil., chap. 2 : 12: "Wherefore, my dearly beloved, with fear and trembling work out your salvation;" and again to the Corinthians, chap 4 : 4: "For I am not conscious to myself of any thing, yet I am not hereby JUSTIFIED, but he that judgeth me is the Lord."

* Rom. 3 : 26. "Just and the justifier of him who is of the faith of Jesus Christ."—Douay Bible.

† Rom. 10 : 2, 3. "A zeal of God, but not according to knowledge," "not knowing the justice of God, and seeking to establish their own, have not submitted themselves to the justice of God."—Douay Bible.

Q. Do these texts prove the falsehood of the Protestant doctrine in question?

A. Very clearly indeed. They show it to be as unscriptural as it is presumptuous.

Q. But do Catholics believe that we should always remain in a state of doubt, as to whether we are in a state of grace?

A. Catholics hold, that those who fear God may have, not the certainty of faith, as Protestants teach, but a moral certainty that they are in possession of God's grace; but nothing except a revelation from God, who knows the heart, can give us an absolute certainty.

Q. What is the Protestant doctrine on the subject of penitential works?

A. Protestants pretend, that Jesus Christ has so satisfied for our sins, that, on our part, fasting and other works of penance are entirely useless.

Q. Is it wonderful that Protestantism should have some professors, since it teaches such a convenient doctrine?

A. Not at all; since such doctrine opens a *wide, easy*, and flowery path to heaven for unrepenting and vicious Christians. According to this, they may serve the devil and serve God at one and the same time.

Q. Does the Scripture teach this doctrine, so flattering to the passions?

A. No, certainly; the Prophet Joel, chap. 2 : 12, says: "Now, therefore, be converted to me with all your heart, *in fasting*, and in *weeping*, and in *mourning*." St. John the Baptist, Matt. 3 : 8, adds: "Bring forth, therefore, worthy fruits of penance." In St. Luke, 13 : 3, our Saviour says: "Unless you do penance, you shall all equally perish." In the 12th chapter, he says to those who brought not forth worthy fruits of penance: "Woe to thee, Corozain; woe to thee, Bethsaida; for if in Tyre and Sidon had been wrought the miracles that have been wrought in you, *they had long ago done penance in sackcloth and ashes*." He tells us elsewhere, that unless we *take up our cross*, and follow him, we can not be his disciples. St. Paul, 1 Cor. 9 : 27, says: "I chastise my body, and bring it into subjection." And again we are told: "If we live by the flesh we shall die, but if, by the spirit, we mortify the deeds of the flesh, we shall live."

Q. Do you find, by the perusal of these passages, that, according to Scripture, Christ has so satisfied for us, that we may safely dispense with all crosses, sufferings, mortifications, and works of penance?

A. No; the very reverse is so evident, that a man must be either very ignorant, or blind with prejudice, not to see it.

CHAP. III.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Is it "the Protestant doctrine, that the moment we believe in Jesus Christ, we are infallibly assured of God's grace"?

A. No. No such doctrine is held by the Protestant Episcopal Church, nor do I know of *any* Reformed Church which has this in its Articles, Creed, or Confession of Faith.

Q. What must we think of a writer who could make such a statement as that of the Doctrinal Catechism about this?

A. He is, to say the least, *ignorant* of the doctrines which he attacks, and, I fear, reckless in his statements and arguments, presuming upon the supposed ignorance of his readers. (I must ask you all to notice, that as many Protestants *do* believe that "those who fear God *may* have a *moral certainty* that they are in possession of God's grace," this is just what the Doctrinal Catechism says that "*Catholics hold*"!)

Q. Has not our Lord and Redeemer made the only and sufficient sacrifice for all the sins of all men?

A. Yes: He is "the Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world."* So, also, St. John says: "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and He *is the propitiation for our sins*, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world."† If the Roman Church does not join with us in holding this, it is in rebellion against the Lord.

* John 1:29. So the Douay Bible.

† 1 John 2:1, 2. "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the just," etc., (as above.)—Douay Bible.

Q. Is it according to Protestant doctrine, that because our Lord alone makes atonement for our sins, we "may serve the devil and serve God at the same time"?

A. We have already seen what the belief of Protestants about this is, and also noticed how in fact virtue is more successfully taught among them than in the Roman Church. If the unhappy man who first published the above false charge is yet alive, let us hope that he is not conscious of having *known* better. Otherwise, if there were any virtue in "penance," we could hardly conceive of one severe enough to atone for a calumny so malicious and so impudent.

Q. What is "penance"?

A. It is one of the superstitious practices of the Roman Church, altogether aside from the "good works," which are the natural fruit and sign of love to God and man. Penance means the inflicting of some pain or privation upon ourselves at the command of a priest, in order to obtain the pardon of God. The like of it is found in some heathen religions; but there is not a word of it in Holy Scripture, nor was such a thing thought of until long after the Apostles, (as we shall see by and by.)

Q. But the Doctrinal Catechism quotes Scripture for it?

A. This is by a false translation, as can be plainly shown. For instance, in the passage of St. Luke it should be, "Unless ye *repent*," etc., (not, "unless ye *do penance*.") The word which we translated *repent*, means in the original Greek, literally to *change the mind*. Common-sense will easily decide which is most likely to give the meaning of that in English—whether, "repent," that is, be truly sorry for sins, renounce them, and begin to try to do good—or, "do penance." Of course we believe in *repentance*, and in keeping our evil nature in subjection, by resisting wicked desires.

CHAP. IV.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What do Protestants teach as regards the Church ?

A. That she fell into gross errors, and corrupted the purity of the Gospel doctrine of Christ.

Q. Is this clearly in opposition to Scripture ?

A. Yes ; because the Gospel tells us, (Matt. 18 : 17,) that the Church can never fall into error : " Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall never prevail against it." A rock is its foundation, Christ its builder, and his power its prop and support. " He that will not hear the Church," says Christ, " is to be reputed as a heathen and a publican." " I will be with you," says Christ again, to his Apostles and their successors, "*all days* (that is, each and every day) to the end of the world." In fine, St. Paul calls the Church the *pillar and ground of truth*. 1 Tim. 3 : 15.

Q. What do Protestants teach of the Church ?

A. They teach that she was invisible during more than a thousand years, pretending that there were *always* men who held *their* faith secretly, but that they dared not profess it outwardly.

Q. Could such a pusillanimous and cowardly body as this be the Church of Christ ?

A. No ; for the people of Christ must not only *believe with the heart, but openly profess with the tongue*. Rom. 10 : 10 : " For with the *heart* we believe unto justice, but with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."

Q. To what does Christ compare the Church ? (Matt. 18 : 17.)

A. To a city on the top of a mountain, visible to all the eyes in the world.

Q. What do you conclude from these words, (Matt. 18 : 17,) " If he will not hear them, tell the Church" ?

A. That the Church must have been always visible, otherwise there must have been a time during which this command of Christ was impossible on account of the invisibility of the Church ; for no one could lay his

complaint before an *invisible* Church. Hence the Catholic is the true Church, since she is the only Church that has been always visible.

CHAP. IV.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Did not the Church at one time fall generally into gross errors of doctrine and practice?

A. This is as plain a matter of history as that it existed at all at that time. We think it far more reasonable to admit that this can be because it *positively has been*, than to deny that it has been, *in spite of facts*, because we have decided that it can not be.

Q. Does this fact contradict the promises of our Lord?

A. By no means. He *has in fact*, made the Church to come down to our times, and is continuing it on to the coming generations. He *has* preserved the knowledge of the Gospel of salvation by it, especially in the Holy Scriptures,* and he has in these latter days made the glory of God to arise upon it again in the Reformation. Thus "the gates (or power) of hell" have not prevailed against it, though they threatened to, in those fearful corruptions of the Dark Ages. A true believer may fall into sins, and yet return to his duty and finally be saved. So, also, may the Church trusting in Him who will never leave nor forsake it, say: "Rejoice not over me, O mine enemy! for though I fall I shall rise again."

Q. What do you say of all this in the Doctrinal Catechism about "the Church being invisible more than a thousand years," etc., etc.?

A. That I have no concern with it, as I have no such notion.†

* It is a wonderful mark of the presence of our Lord with the Church that these books were preserved complete through the Dark Ages, though they are so plainly opposed to the errors of those times.

† Some Protestants have so said, though I think very erroneously. Yet were it true, as the Doctrinal Catechism argues, that the visible Church generally could not seriously err without perishing utterly, they are right; for *in certain facts, it did so err* in the Dark Ages, as well as in the time of the Arian heresy. (See p. 103.)

CHAP. V.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What do Protestants teach on the subject of the Scripture ?

A. They pretend that the Sacred Volume is so clear, that every one, learned and ignorant, may easily know its meaning.

Q. Does St. Peter think with Protestants in this matter ?

A. No, indeed. In his 2d Epistle, chap. 3 : 16, he says, that there are some things in the Epistles of St. Paul that are hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as also the *other Scriptures, to their own destruction.*

Q. Do Protestants teach any other absurdity on the subject of the Scripture ?

A. Yes ; they try to persuade their followers that the Scripture contains all God's revealed will, and that nothing is to be believed or practised but what is expressly laid down in that divine Book.

Q. Is this doctrine in accordance with the Scripture itself ?

A. No ; it is directly opposed to the words of St. Paul, 2 Thess. 2 : 14 : "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the *traditions* which you have been *taught*, whether by word or our Epistle."

Q. What do Protestants teach on the Eucharist ?

A. It is not an easy matter to answer this question ; for to these four words, *this is my body*, each Protestant gives his own peculiar meaning. Some say that the body of Christ is *in* the bread ; some, that it is *under* the bread ; some, that it is *with* the bread ; some that it has no connection with the bread, but that you receive the body when you eat the bread ; and some, in fine, say, that the body of Christ is not present in any sense whatever—that the whole affair is a bare *memorial*.

Q. Are Protestants Scriptural in this matter ?

A. No ; they teach the very reverse of Scripture. Christ says, "This is my body ;" they say, "It is *not* his body."

Q. How many distinct passages of Scripture are there to prove the real presence ?

A. Fourteen—all contained in the following texts : Matt. 16 : 26, 28 ; Mark 14 : 22, 24 ; Luke 22 : 19, 20 ; 1 Corinth. 11 : 23, 25 ; John 6 : 51, 60, 66 ; 1 Corinth. 10 : 16 ; 1 Corinth. 11 : 27, 29.

Q. Is there one text of Scripture which declares the Eucharist to be mere bread and mere wine ?

A. No, not so much as one ; and hence the faith of Protestants on this subject is not only not Scriptural, but anti-scriptural.

Q. What say Protestants of Confession ?

A. That it is an unscriptural, Popish practice.

Q. Is it then unscriptural ?

A. No ; the very reverse. St. James, chap. 5 : 6, says : “ *Confess your sins one to another.* ” The first Christians, under the direction of the Apostles themselves, practised confession, Acts 19 : 18, 19 : “ And many that believed came and confessed, and showed their deeds.” See also Num. 5 : 6–8 ; Lev. 12 : 15 ; Matt. 3 : 5, 6.

Q. But why confess sin at all ?

A. That, according to the law of Christ, those who are penitent may be absolved by the Priests of Christ's Church, lawfully sent and ordained.

Q. Do we find in Scripture that any such power was given to the priests of the Church ?

A. Yes ; we have for this the clearest texts of the Inspired Volume. In John 20 : 21, Christ says to his first chosen pastors, “ As my Father has sent me, even so I send you ; ” and in chap. 17 : 18, of same Gospel, “ *As thou hast sent me into the world, even so I have also sent them into the world.* ” But Christ was sent into the world with power to forgive sins ; therefore, as he communicated to his first pastors the same power he had himself, they also had power to forgive sins : indeed, he expressly declares it—John 20 : 21–23 : “ Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them ; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained.” And elsewhere, he says : “ Whatsoever you shall bind on

earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven."

Q. Are Protestant doctrines equally unscriptural as regards the other Sacraments?

A. Yes; their doctrines are all anti-scriptural as regards these. On Extreme Unction, see James chap. 5 : 14 : on Holy Orders, read 1 Tim. 4 : 14 ; 2 Tim. 1 : 6 ; Acts 6 : 6, and 14 : 23 : on Matrimony, see Eph. 5 : 24, 25, 32.

Q. When you read these passages, do you find that Protestants teach Scriptural doctrines?

A. No; they evidently teach the very contrary. Their empty vauntings about Scripture, are only calculated to blind the ignorant and mislead the unwary.

CHAP. V.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Do Protestants deny what is said by St. Peter in his 2d Epistle 3 : 16?

A. No; as we have already seen, they obediently receive this with all the rest of the word of God. But I do not see that this forbids me to read for myself in that Book, or bids me put myself in blind slavery to a priest for fear of damnation. I believe, with all the early Christians, and as (*St.*) *Chrysostom* says, that, in the main, "all things are open and plain in the Holy Scriptures. Whatsoever things there are necessary for us, are plain."*

Q. Do Protestants contradict Scripture in finding all of this necessary truth in it?

A. No; in this they only render it proper honor, and obey God who gave it to us. We have already seen (p. 107) what St. Paul means by "tradition." They, however, who set mere human notions and practices on a level with this WORD OF GOD do seriously (though, let us hope, ignorantly) affront his authority.

* Hom. iii. in 2 ad Thess. Op. xi. 332. (Ed. Font Doc.)

Q. What do you say of the charge that Protestants, in regard to the Eucharist, (or Lord's Supper,) "teach the very reverse of Scripture"?

A. I pronounce it utterly untrue, and promise *in the proper place* to prove to any fair mind that the Protestant Church in this holds the true meaning of the Scriptures, and this just as the first Christians understood it; and that the present doctrine of the Roman Church is a wide and dangerous departure from this.

Q. Why probably does the Doctrinal Catechism here bring in confidently, as a mere *instance* of the errors of Protestants, in defense of which nothing could be said, what is really *one of the most important matters* in the inquiry whether the Roman Church holds false doctrine—afterward taking *sixty pages* to argue this?

A. I can not imagine why, unless to impose upon the reader in advance (about what it knows it will find so hard to prove) by an air of triumphant confidence.

Q. Do Protestants believe in the confession of sin?

A. Indeed they do. They have a very solemn form for it in public worship, and they are taught to confess to God in their secret prayers; and to one another, when they have done one another wrong.

Q. Is the secret confession to a priest used in the Roman Church enjoined any where in the Scriptures?

A. The Scriptures mention no other confession than such as is used among Protestants. Take for instance this passage: "Confess your sins one to another."* This we do when we have wronged one another. But if I go and make a secret confession to a priest, will he in his turn make a like confession to me?†

Q. Is this secret confession necessary in order that the priest may forgive my sins?

A. The doctrine that priests have this power is one of the worst errors of the Roman Church. It was never heard of for 500 years after the Apostles, nor was this *secret confession* established with it until 600 years later yet, in the deepest darkness of the Dark

Jas. 5 : 16 : "Confess therefore your sins one to another."—Douay Bible.

† All this will be more fully examined in its proper place hereafter. (See p. .)

Ages. So confesses Fleury: "This (A.D. 1215) is the first canon that I know of which commanded generally sacramental confession."*

Q. But that Church, to support this practice, quotes these words of our Lord to the Apostles, "As my Father hath sent me, even so I send you;" and, "Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose sins ye retain, they are retained"?

A. What these words mean will be shown in the proper place. (See p. 294.) That they do not prove the Roman doctrine is plain from this, that *the first Christians* never understood them so, as we shall see by and by. In the mean time let whoever can, answer these questions: 1st, Is every priest an Apostle? 2d, Did our Lord mean that even the Apostles were sent like him *in all things*? (as when we read that "the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world."†) 3d. Where has our Lord said, "Confess your sins to a priest, that they may be forgiven," or any thing like it? *Yes, WHERE?*

Q. What shall we say of the references to Scripture of the Doctrinal Catechism to prove the doctrines of Protestants unsound in regard to "the other sacraments"?

A. When we come to discuss these subjects, (see pp. 291, etc.,) we shall find the Scriptures sustaining the doctrines of the Reformed Churches.

CHAP. VI.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Have you any other proofs that they are not guided by the Scripture?

A. Yes; so many, that we can not admit more than a mere specimen into this small work. They *reject* much that is *clearly contained* in Scripture, and *profess* more that is *no where discoverable* in that Divine Book.

Q. Give some examples of both?

A. They should, if the Scripture were their only

* Ecc. Hist. xvi. 400.

† 1 John 4: 14: "The Father hath sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world."—Douay Bible.

rule, wash the feet of one another, according to the command of Christ, in the 13th chap. of St. John; they should keep, not the Sunday, but the Saturday, according to the commandment, "Remember thou keep holy the SABBATH-day;" for this commandment has not, *in Scripture*, been changed or abrogated; they should receive, what they call the sacrament, after supper, and not in the morning, because Christ instituted that sacrament at night, and his Apostles received it after supper; they should not eat blood or strangled meat, because the Apostles forbid it in the 15th chap. of the Acts; they should not baptize infants, as there is no example in Scripture to justify such a practice.

Q. What inference would you draw from all this?

A. That Protestants ought rather to call themselves Anti-Evangelicals, than Evangelicals, as their doctrines are opposed to, rather than in conformity with, the Gospel.

CHAP. VI.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What can you say of the pretended instances given by the Doctrinal Catechism in which Protestants "*reject* much that is clearly contained in Scripture, and *profess* more that is no where discoverable in that Divine Book"?

A. Of the *five* things thus enumerated, only *one* belongs to the latter class, (of things "*professed*;") and this we practise *because we find it* in the Scriptures. The Roman Church retains it too, though "*no where discoverable in that Divine Book*"! Of the four mentioned as not used by us, this is *because we do not find them* enjoined as our duty in the Book. The Roman Church *also rejects them*, yet declaring that they are "*clearly contained in the Scriptures*"!

Q. How then do the two great parties to this question stand toward the Holy Writings?

A. The Roman Church, while professing to reverence and obey them, denounces them as so difficult to be understood, that they *can not* make a man "*wise unto salvation*," (as those Scriptures themselves say they

can,*) tortures their meaning to support false doctrines, and insults them by associating with them a pretended "unwritten word of God." The Reformed Churches revere them, submit all opinions to them, study to learn their honest meaning in all things, and seek to make all men read and hear them *freely* and *fully* for themselves.

We may add that the Roman Church, in persuading, and when possible compelling, men *not* "to search the Scriptures" for themselves, can not by any of its artful arguments for this, deceive the *common-sense* of mankind, which sees that this is really to keep men from detecting its wide departure from what God has taught therein.

My reader, so far we have not been able to get at a direct examination of the false doctrines which the Roman Church is charged with holding. Yet, (even if you had never thought of such a thing before,) tell me, as you really wish to know the truth, are you not already doubtful whether that is the *pure* and *only* Church of our Lord Jesus Christ, as it claims to be? We shall now see it put upon its defense, and clearly convicted of monstrous additions to what God has revealed.



CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Of our Lord Jesus Christ and the Saints.

Q. How many natures are there in Jesus Christ?

A. Two: the Divine and human natures; for Jesus Christ is true God and true man.

Q. How many persons are there in Jesus Christ?

A. Only one; he is a Divine, and not a human person, although he has a human nature.

Q. What do you conclude from this?

A. That all the works of Jesus Christ are divine, in-

* 2 Tim. 3: 15: "The Holy Scriptures which can instruct thee unto salvation."—Douay Bible.

finite in value; because, the more excellent the person, the more valuable are his works: hence, the works of the divine person of Jesus Christ must be infinite in merit.

Q. Was it his Divinity or his humanity that suffered for us?

A. It was his humanity that fasted, prayed, and suffered for us; still we are right in saying it was God who suffered, because his sufferings and works must be attributed to the *person*, and the person of Jesus Christ is God.

Q. Where is Jesus Christ?

A. As he is a Divine person, he is every where; but his humanity is only in heaven, and on the altar in the holy sacrament. Nor can it be said, that, as his Divinity is every where, so is his humanity, for that does not follow.

Q. Show us, by an example, how it does not follow?

A. A man's head is intimately connected with his soul; yet it is not in every place where the soul is, otherwise the head would be in the feet also.

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Who is our Lord Jesus Christ?

A. He is "Our Lord," the glorious master and King of Christians; "Jesus," the one only and all-sufficient Saviour of sinners; "Christ," the anointed Pastor, Priest, and atoning Sacrifice of all who truly repent, believe on him, and thus return to the love of God, that is, of all THE CHURCH.

Q. Is he God or man, or what?

A. He is plainly made known to us in the Gospel, as both God and man, being the second person of the Most Holy Trinity, which is the One God. Having been born of our race, in the midst of the ages many hundred years ago, lived for thirty years in the land of Palestine, suffered death upon the cross for our redemption, and risen from the dead, he afterwards ascended

into heaven. There he is now in great majesty, reigning over the Church.

Q. Has he ever been seen in this world since his ascension?

A. He is continually present with the Church, especially in its assemblies, but only in a *spiritual* and *unseen* manner. We have no reason to think that he has been since *seen* upon earth, except in miraculous visions by St. Stephen and St. Paul.* We, his people in this world, "walk" in his love, "by faith, and not by sight."† St. Paul also says, in the same place, that, "While we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord."‡ So, also, St. Peter says of our Lord to the Christians of his time: "Whom *having not seen* ye love; in whom, though *now ye see him not*, yet *believing*, ye rejoice."§

Q. Is it proved to you by the Doctrinal Catechism, that our Lord's "humanity is on the altar in the holy sacrament"?

A. No more than it is that my soul is in my feet.¶

CHAP. II.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What do we owe to Jesus Christ?

A. We owe him a sovereign confidence, love, and worship.

Q. What worship is due to him?

A. That sovereign worship or adoration which is due to God, and to God only.

Q. Do Catholics *adore* the saints?

A. God forbid that we should give to any, or all of the saints, the worship which is due to God: we honor

* Acts 7 : 55, and 22 : 18.

† 2 Cor. 5 : 7. So the Douay Bible.

‡ V. 6. "While we are in the body we are absent from the Lord."—Douay Bible.

§ 1 Peter 1 : 8. "Whom having not seen you love, in whom also, though now you see him not, you believe, and believing, shall rejoice."—Douay Bible.

¶ I know not what else to say to the astonishing argument on p. 126, about the "head" and the "feet."

the saints as God's servants, enriched and honored with his divine grace.

Q. Do not Catholics consecrate altars, and offer upon them the sacrifice of the Mass to the saints?

A. No : altars are erected and consecrated to God alone ; to God alone is the sacrifice of the Mass offered ; the former under the invocation of the saints, and the latter in memory of the saints.

Q. Why do we owe to Jesus Christ a sovereign confidence ?

A. Because he is the only mediator, in the proper sense of the word, between God and man.

Q. Why do you say he is the only mediator ?

A. Because he alone could, and did, satisfy for sin ; he alone merited for us all the graces we receive from God.

Q. Could not a saint satisfy for the sins of men ?

A. No ; all the angels and saints that ever were, or ever will be, could not have satisfied the justice of God for even one mortal sin ; because, by sin, an Infinite Being was offended ; his justice required infinite satisfaction. Now, this could not be given by any number or quality of saints or angels, who are, and must essentially be, finite creatures ; but Christ, being a Divine person, could easily offer sufficient, because *infinite* satisfaction, by restoring to God the glory of which sin had deprived him.

Q. Has Jesus Christ merited for us all heavenly graces ?

A. Yes ; " Blessed be the God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with spiritual blessings in heavenly places, in Christ." (Ephes. chap.1.)

Q. Do the saints merit graces for us ?

A. They may, by their prayers, obtain graces for us from God, but they can not, of themselves, merit them. It was Christ alone, who could, and did, merit and purchase them with the price of his blood, both for the saints and for us.

Q. Why do you say we owe to Jesus Christ a sovereign love ?

A. Because it was he " who delivered us from the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love." (Coloss. chap. 1.)

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What do I owe to our Lord Jesus Christ ?

A. "To believe in him, to love him with all my heart, to worship him, to give thanks to him, to put my whole trust in him, to call upon him, and to serve him truly all the days of my life."

Q. Are we any where in the Word of God told to call upon any other persons than him in our public or private worship ?

A. NO WHERE WHATEVER. On the contrary, while we are often urged to "make known our requests unto God,"* we are *warned against* in any way associating creatures with Him in this.

Q. Is it, then, necessary, or even safe in praying to God, to add to this by "invoking," or praying to, angels, or holy men who have departed this life, even supposing that they can hear us ?

A. It is foolish and blasphemous to suppose this *necessary*, for God, in his Holy Word, tells us to "call upon *him* in the day of trouble,"† and that he "*is love*."‡ Our Lord Christ says, "Come unto *me* all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest;"§ and, "If ye will ask any thing *in my name*, I will do it."|| So, the Scripture says elsewhere : "There is one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus."¶ Thus, as God himself hears all our prayers, and is so *gracious* that it would be impious to suppose that he needed to be *softened* by the entreaties of other persons, I need pray to no others.

And as this is *unnecessary*, so it is unsafe. For, if I invoke other persons in my prayers, I am certainly in some danger of not thinking of *God only* as the giver

* Phil. 4 : 6 : "Let your petitions be made known to God."—Douay Bible.

† Ps. 50 : 15. So the Douay Bible.

‡ 1 John 4 : 16 : "God is charity."—Douay Bible.

§ Matt. 11 : 28 : "Come to me all you that labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you."—Douay Bible.

|| John 14 : 14 : "If you shall ask me any thing in my name, that I will do."—Douay Bible.

¶ 1 Tim. 2 : 5 : "There is one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus."—Douay Bible.

of good, but trusting and being grateful to them—yes, and even of worshipping them. (I appeal to those who use such prayers to “saints,” etc., whether they do not know in their souls, that they are strongly tempted to this.)

CHAP. III.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Do Catholics glorify Christ and his merits more than Protestants?

A. Yes; much more. They worship him more frequently and more intensely—they glorify him in his saints, and in the pictures and images of him, which they keep with respect and veneration.

Q. Why do you say that Catholics worship Christ in his person, more than Protestants?

A. Because the worship which Catholics render to the person of Christ, present in the sacrament and sacrifice of the altar, shows it sufficiently. In conformity with their creed, they render to Christ, really present, all the adoration in their power.

Q. Why have you said that Catholics honor Christ, in his saints, more than Protestants do?

A. Because Catholics, in honoring the saints, only glorify Jesus, who, by his mercies and graces, has made these saints what they are, worthy of our veneration and imitation; and, as often as Catholics show respect or veneration before a picture or image of Jesus, they uniformly refer both, not to the *mere matter* before them, but to the prototype, Jesus Christ himself.

Q. Why do you say that Catholics honor the merits of Christ more than Protestants?

A. Because Catholics think more of his sufferings and passion than their adversaries. Catholics observe Lent, a fast of forty days, in honor of his fasting and sorrows; they abstain from the luxury of flesh meat on Friday, in honor of his death; they make frequent use of the sign of the cross, to keep them in mind of the tortures he endured for sinners, and that it is from the merits of his passion and death on the cross, that they

hope for heavenly strength and grace; they end every prayer by these words, "Through Jesus Christ our Lord;" and the last name they utter when they are dying is his holy name: Jesus, therefore, is the only hope of every Catholic; and those of our adversaries who say otherwise, are guilty of the very extreme of injustice; since all we ask the saints to do, is to pray for us to our Divine Saviour.

CHAP. III.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Can one who thus invokes saints and angels glorify Christ and his merits as much as one who addresses him directly and alone in his prayers?

A. IT IS IMPOSSIBLE. He who in his prayers calls upon our Lord *directly*, and *only*—who in his worship thinks only of his glorious and most holy merits; and who depends upon no one else to obtain the pardon of his sins, a holy mind and eternal life at last, can surely love, adore, and serve him more fervently than one who prays* to many other beings.

Q. Can one worship God better by believing that he *sees* him present to his bodily eyes, or by using images?

A. Plainly not; for he *forbids* any such worship, saying, "God is a *spirit*, and they that worship him, must worship him *in spirit*;"† and, "Thou shalt not make unto thyself any *graven image*, nor *the likeness of any thing*—thou shalt not bow down to them."‡ This is one (the 2d) of the Ten Commandments.

Q. Can we worship our Lord more by giving veneration, and making prayers to the departed souls of persons who once lived upon earth?

A. No; for whatever we may call this, we are thus giving his worship to them. If we wish to worship

* The Roman Church does literally call it *praying*. "The saints are to be prayed to."—Cat. of Council of Trent on Prayer, p. 324.

† John 4: 24: "God is a spirit, and they that adore him must adore him in spirit."—Douay Bible.

‡ More particularly about this commandment and its exact words, see p.

him, why not do it directly? Otherwise, why does God in his Holy Word say so much of worshipping and calling upon him directly, and *not one word* of this better way of worshipping, through the "saints"?

Q. What do you say of the pretended instances given by the Doctrinal Catechism, in which they of the Roman Church "honor the merits of Christ more than Protestants"?

A. No one, indeed, honors those most glorious merits enough. Yet we also do all of these things, except certain mere outward practices not commanded by God; in which, as all the world knows, men are often *very zealous* and *punctual*, while, in disobedience to *plain commands of God*, they are very worldly and wicked in their lives. Yet these are some of those who, *because* they do such things, and *because* they worship others than God, claim to be better Christians than the most devout and virtuous Protestants!

CHAP. IV.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Do not Catholics abandon God, and put their trust in the saints, when they ask the prayers of the saints?

A. No, certainly; not so much as Protestants do, when they ask the prayers of sinful men.

Q. Is it not derogatory to the merits of Christ to invoke the saints?

A. Certainly not; since the Scripture declares, that the prayer even of the *just man* availeth much.

Q. In what are Protestants deceived on this subject?

A. In supposing that Catholics substitute the saints for Christ, and place their hope in the former and not in the latter. This is a very mistaken notion. Catholics do not ask grace from the saints; they merely ask the saints to pray that God may grant them all necessary graces through Christ. They say, when addressing God, "*Have mercy on us;*" "*Forgive our sins;*" but when addressing the Blessed Virgin or the saints: "*Pray for us.*" Catholics know well, that all the virtues, merits, and graces of the saints are derived, not from themselves, but from Jesus Christ.

Q. Are the merits of the saints, then, useless to us ?

A. No ; the more agreeable the saints are to God, the more powerful will their intercession be in our favor ; consequently, the more meritoriously they have coöperated with God's grace, the more useful will their prayers be to us ; in the same manner that we value more the prayers of the man that is *truly* just, than we do those of him who is *imperfectly* so.

Q. In whose place do we put the saints ?

A. Not in the place of *Jesus Christ*, but in *our own* ; we conjure them to join with us in fervent prayer to God, that, through *Jesus Christ*, we may obtain all the graces we stand in need of.

CHAP. IV.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. May we *pray* to the departed souls of saints, because it is proper to *ask* our living fellow-men to *pray* for us ?

A. No : because while we are *living together in this world* we can and ought to help one another every way. Thus we are commanded to “pray, one for another.”* Therefore, when I ask my friend to pray for me, I know that he hears me, and can do it. But, if I ask a *departed soul* to pray for me, I can not reasonably believe that it hears my request, without supposing that, *like God*, though in Paradise or heaven, it is also every where in this world ; or, at least, that it knows all that is going on here. (With what other thought can a hundred million worshippers be all at the same time calling upon St. Mary the mother of our Lord ?) Thus, I in fact, make “other gods” of them, as is indeed admitted by those who practise this when they themselves call it “*praying to the saints*.” Cardinal Bellarmine, also, the very highest authority among the writers of that Church, says that the “saints” are “*gods by participation*.”† Look well at that now. Is it not paganism ?

* James 5 : 16. So the Douay Bible.

† De Cult. Sanct. l. iii. c. 9.

Q. To call upon "the saints" at all is, then, a superstitious and dangerous practice; but *do* they in the Roman Church only ask the saints to pray to God for them?

A. They who say so, *seek to* "deceive Protestants," and even to mislead their own devout people. Their prayer-books are full of such sentences as these: "*We fly to thy patronage, O holy mother of God: despise not our petitions in our necessities, but deliver us from all dangers, O most glorious and blessed Virgin!*"* "Hail Mary, lady and mistress of the world, to WHOM ALL POWER HAS BEEN GIVEN, BOTH IN HEAVEN AND IN EARTH!"† Is that the way in which you would ask one of your friends to pray for you? Is it not as much a prayer *to St. Mary*, and a worship of her, as any that you could offer to God? Ask yourself this question now, you, my dear fellow-man, who have been in the habit of using such devotions.

CHAP V.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Does the sacred Scripture order us to invoke the saints?

A. It neither expressly orders nor forbids it.

Q. Is it not said in the 49th Psalm?—"Call upon me in the day of tribulation;" and in the 11th chap. of St. Matthew?—"Come to me all you that labor and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you." And are not these clear commands to invoke God alone?

A. As these passages do not forbid us to ask the prayers of men, so neither do they forbid us to ask the intercession of the saints.

Q. What, then, does God demand in these passages?

A. He demands that we invoke him, and him only, as our *sovereign Lord*, from whom both the saints and we must draw all help and consolation.

Q. Is it useful to ask the prayers of the saints?

A. Yes, surely most useful, if it be at all useful to have recourse to the prayers even of men.

* "True Piety."—Lit. of the Virgin, p. 38.

† Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Mary.

Q. How do you know that it is useful to have recourse to the prayers of men?

A. In the first place, all sects admit this; and, secondly, God himself orders the friends of Job to have recourse to Job's prayers, (chap. 42 :) "Go to my servant Job, . . . and my servant Job shall pray for you; his face I will accept, that folly be not imputed to you."

Q. Do the angels and saints hear us when we ask their prayers?

A. Protestants admit, that even the devils know what is passing on earth; and yet they deny this knowledge to the blessed and perfect angels and saints of God. In Matt. 15, we are told, that "there is joy over one sinner that doeth penance, more than over ninety-nine just persons." If the saints and angels can see in this world even the *penitent heart*, they surely hear our prayers without any difficulty. In Luke 16, Abraham, *who according to Protestants*, must have been in heaven, heard the supplications of Dives, or the rich man, who was certainly in hell. See also Zachary 1 : 12.

CHAP. V.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Does God in his Book, *command* or *forbid* the invoking of departed saints in our prayers?

A. It is *agreed by all* that he does not command it. That is enough of itself, for such "invocation" has been proved to be unnecessary and unsafe. The *silence* of God's Word about what our fellow-Christians of the Roman Church make a great part of their religion, is truly AWFUL. But that is not all. God *warns us against* such practices, saying: "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and *worshipping of angels*, intruding into those things which he hath not seen."* That is, "Do not go beyond what I tell you, and fancy that you humble yourselves the more

* Col. 2 : 18: "Let no man seduce you willing in humility and religion of angels, walking in the things which he hath not seen."—Douay Bible. These translators have done their best to conceal the sense of this passage.

before me, and do me the more honor by worshipping any of my chief servants, whether angels or men." A book of great repute in the Roman Church in Europe,* ventures to support this worship of angels by these words of Holy Scripture: "And when I had heard and seen, I *fell down to worship* before the feet of the angel who showed me these things"—forgetting to add what follows: "Then saith he unto me, SEE THOU DO IT NOT, for I am thy *fellow-servant*, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them who keep the sayings of this book: *WORSHIP GOD.*"†

Q. Is there no instance in Scripture of a prayer to a departed saint?

A. There *is one*, and only one; that of the rich man in hell, calling upon Abraham. But neither the character of the one who made this prayer, nor the answer he received, can tempt me to imitate him.

Q. Have you ever questioned that it was right to ask your brethren in the world to pray for you?

A. No: not only because it is safe and reasonable, but still more because God has enjoined it: "*Pray one for another.*"‡

Q. What shall we say of the arguments of the Doctrinal Catechism, to prove that the saints and angels can hear all the prayers that may be addressed to them?

A. They are absurd. Scripture tells us that the devils are present in the world, and actively at work here, but says nothing of this kind about the departed saints. Yet I never heard of any one who believed that every devil knew every thing that was taking place in the world! Then, too, because when a sinner repents it is known in heaven, we are asked to believe, *without a particle of proof* for it in Holy Scripture, or any where else, that certain departed souls of men and

* Another "Doctrinal Catechism."

† Rev. 22 : 8, 9: "And after I had heard and seen, I fell down to adore before the feet of the angel who showed me these things. And he said unto me, See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them that keep the words of the prophecy of this book: adore God."—Douay Bible.

‡ James 5 : 16. So the Douay Bible.

women can know, and at the same instant attend to, what is said to them by a hundred million different persons, in all parts of the world!

CHAP. VI.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Is the practice of invoking the saints of very ancient date?

A. Yes; even the Protestant Centuriators of Magdebourg admit, that it has existed since the third century, at which time all agree that the Church was pure. "You may trace," say they, "manifest vestiges of the invocation of saints in the third century;" thus Origen says: "Holy Job, pray for us." The Protestants who drew up the Augsburg and Helvetic Confession, define it as sound Protestant doctrine, "that relative and inferior veneration is due to the saints and angels." To the same effect the testimony of all the early Fathers, and even of nearly all the most learned Protestant bishops, along with Kemnitius, and Luther himself, who says: "I therefore, with the *whole* Catholic Church, hold that the saints are to be honored and invocated by us."

Q. What do you conclude from all this?

A. That the invocation of the saints, angels, and blessed Virgin, is a good and salutary practice, seeing that it has been adopted in every age of the Church; that it has been taught and practised by the wise, and learned, and the good; and that the most learned, though bitterest, enemies have been compelled to admit its utility.

CHAP. VI.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. When did this custom of praying to saints and angels begin?

A. There is *not a trace* of such a practice among the very first Christians, but a plain denial of it.* Yet the like existed in the heathen religions around, from which

* See Mart. of Polycarp, xvi. Irenæus, ii. 35. Clem. Alex. Strom. vii. 853.

it indeed gradually crept into the Church. However, even Augustine (300 years after the Apostles) says: "Let not the worship of dead men be any part of our religion; they ought so to be honored that we may *imitate* them, but *not worshipped*."* So Chrysostom, meeting the very excuse which the Roman Church now makes for this, says: "We do not so much please God by praying *through others* as *in person*. For, as he seeks our love, he does all things in such a way that we may *trust in Him*. When he sees any one coming to him *personally*, then he grants his requests most freely."† Yet the wrong practice had already faintly begun with praying *for* holy departed souls. This, in the course of time, passed into calling upon them to *pray for us*, and finally into downright worship of them.

Q. Is it true that the Reformed Churches have ever in any way approved of the worship of saints and angels?

A. It is an utter falsehood, like many others in the Doctrinal Catechism, which we have already had to notice.

Q. What do you "conclude from all this"?

A. That the "invocation of saints" is no part of the Christian religion, but a dangerous superstition, frequently amounting in fact to idolatry. I see that whatever distinction in words may be made, of giving "Latria" only to God; and "Doulia" and "Hyperdoulia" to others, that it is "having other gods" beside him, the only One; and that it would lead me to put at least a part of my trust in other merits and mediators than the all-sufficient, atoning merits of the one mediator, Christ; and to share with other persons that adoring love and entire service which I owe to my blessed and beloved Lord and Redeemer. You who read this now, whether you have never heretofore prayed at all, or have often prayed to saints, will you not now join with me in vowing that you will hereafter draw near to God through Christ our Lord, and only through him?

* De Vera Relig. 108.

† In Ps. iv. Op. v. p. 8. He also proves that Christ must be God, because (Acts 20: 16) St. Paul was directed to call upon him in prayer. "This makes it plain that he is God; for it is not lawful to invoke (call upon) any other than God."—Hom. Op. ix. 398.

Communion under One Kind.

CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Is it necessary to receive the sacrament of the Eucharist under both kinds ?

A. No ; it is not, for three reasons ; first, because what is received under both kinds is received under one kind only ; secondly, because Christ has promised the same reward to the reception of one as to the reception of both ; thirdly, because the ancient Church administered this sacrament often under one kind only.

Q. Why do you say that the same is received under one, as under both species ?

A. Because Christ is received as he is, living and immortal, whole and entire ; and, as a living body is not without blood, or living blood without a body, so Christ is received, as he is, under either the form of bread or the form of wine.

Q. Does the priest, who receives under both, receive more than the Laic ?

A. No ; he receives the same ; for, as a man receiving two hosts would not receive more than he who receives only one, so the reception of one species is equal to the reception of both—Christ whole and entire being received in either case.

Q. Why do priests alone partake of the chalice—have they more right to it than the people ?

A. They alone partake of it in Mass, because it is part of the sacrifice ; but priests, bishops, and even the Pope, receive under one kind only, when they receive out of Mass.

Q. Why do you say that the chalice forms part of the sacrifice ?

A. Because Christ is a priest, according to the order of Melchizedeck ; now Melchizedeck offered bread and wine *both* ; hence, Christ has been pleased to institute the sacrifice of his body and blood, under the forms of bread and of wine.

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What is the Eucharist or Lord's Supper ?

A. It is a sacrament or ceremony instituted by our Lord as a perpetual memorial in the Church, of his dying for us, and as a special means of grace to all who rightly join in it. The outward act of this is the eating and drinking of consecrated bread and wine which represent to us his body and blood.

Q. Does he properly receive this sacrament who only eats of the bread ?

A. No ; for the words of Christ are express : he not only says of the bread, "Take, eat," but also of the cup, "*Drink ye ALL of it ;*" and it is added : "They all drank of it."* It is evident from this, that if it could ever be proper to omit one or the other of the two elements, it should be the *bread* and not the *wine*.

Q. When did this custom of giving only the bread and not the wine to the communicants first take its rise ?

A. In the midst of the Dark Ages. Such a thing was never heard of for more than a thousand years after the Apostles, and indeed was firmly fixed (in Western Europe by the Council of Constance) only about a hundred years before the Reformation.

Q. What do you say of excusing this disobedience to the words of our Lord Christ by the plea that "what is received under both kinds is received under one kind only" ?

A. It is absurd. If I receive only bread, I do not receive bread *and wine*. Why, indeed, in that case, have any wine at all ? The argument that, "a living body is not without blood," etc., is founded on the idea that the bread of the Communion is the corporal flesh of our Lord, which (*as we shall soon see*) is an utter mistaking of this sacrament.

Q. Is this sacrament a sacrifice ?

* Matt. 26 : 26, 27 ; Mark 14 : 23 : "Take ye and eat.—Drink ye all of this.—And they all drank of it."—Douay Bible.

A. In no other sense than any other act of worship is ; and therefore there is no more reason that in it a *priest* should drink of the cup than that any other communicant should.

CHAP. II.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Why do you say that Christ promises the same reward to the reception of one as to the reception of both kinds?

A. Because this is clearly laid down in the sixth chapter of St. John, verse 50 : “ This is the *bread* which cometh down from heaven, that if any man *eat* of it *he may not die*.” 52 : “ If any man *EAT* of this *BREAD* *he shall live forever*.” 58 : “ As I live by the Father, so he that *eateth* me, the same shall live by me.” 59 : “ Not as your fathers did eat manna and are dead : he that *eateth* this *bread* shall live forever.”

Q. What do you observe on these passages?

A. That Christ promised eternal life to those who receive under one kind, as well as to those who receive under both. Indeed, Christ himself administered the sacrament under one kind only to the disciples at Emmaus : “ And it came to pass, whilst he was at table with them, he took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave to them.” St. Paul, 1 Cor. 11 : 27, says : “ Therefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord.” This shows clearly, that the unworthy reception of *either* kind is enough to damn, and consequently, also, the worthy reception, enough to save ; because, both the body and blood of the Lord are profaned, or advantageously received, under either kind, as is evident from the conjunctive particle *AND*, in the latter part of the verse, whilst the disjunctive *OR* is used in the former. From the account of the Last Supper given by St. Luke, 22 : 20, it would appear that the cup was not a necessary, even of the Apostolic communion, for it is given not *during* the supper, but *after* the supper.

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Is it to be believed that our Lord will “reward” those who change what he has ordained?

A. No; if he has said that in this sacrament we are to “drink” as well as to “eat,” and we do only one of these, it is plain disobedience. In such a case he will no doubt deal gently with the misled *people*, but severely with the offending pastors.

Q. What of the arguments, that “Christ himself administered the sacrament under one kind,” etc., and, “it would appear that the cup was not a necessary,” etc.?

A. According to this, *there need be no cup or wine whatever in this sacrament*. Is that what the Roman Church maintains? We shall see fully what these words of Scripture do mean when we fairly come to this matter hereafter. (See p. .)

CHAP. III.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Why have you said that the ancient and pure church administered the sacrament often under one kind only?

A. Because history proves it to be the fact. Nicephorus, Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. 7, St. Cyprian, and St. Basil, all allude to the practice. The latter says, that the solitaries who lived far from towns, were in the habit of carrying with them, for the whole year, the Holy Eucharist, under the form of bread.

Q. Did not Pope Gelasius command all Catholics to receive the chalice?

A. Yes; but this was only for a time, and for the purpose of detecting the Manichean heretics, who considered wine as the creature of the devil. These heretics mingled with the Catholics, and, concealing their heretical principles, approached to communion with them. Hence, the Pope ordered the chalice also to be administered, knowing that this being under the form of wine, would deter these heretics from profaning the sacrament.

Q. What do you conclude from this?

A. That the sacrament must have been previously administered under the form of bread, otherwise this order of Pope Gelasius would have been unnecessary.

Q. How was the sacrament given to the sick, to the young, and to infants?

A. Under the form of bread only in the two former cases, and under the form of wine in the latter; and the Greek Church, during Lent, was in the habit of consecrating on Sunday what should be necessary for the whole week, and under the form of bread only.

CHAP. III.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Is it true that "the ancient and pure Church administered the sacrament often under one kind only"?

A. The more candid and learned men of the Roman Church do not pretend this. Even the Council of Constance, which established that custom in that Church, (more than 1300 years after the Apostles,) says: "*Although Christ instituted this venerable sacrament under both the forms of bread and wine, and although it was received under both kinds in the primitive Church,*" etc.* The pretended facts cited by the Doctrinal Catechism, are mere misstatements. For instance, here are the very words of Gelasius censuring the "Manichees" because they (not secretly, but openly) refused to drink of the cup in the Communion: "We learn that some, a portion of the sacred body only being taken, abstain from the cup of the sacred blood. Undoubtedly, (since I know not by what superstition of education they are restrained,) they ought either to receive the entire sacraments or to be kept from them entirely. Because *a division of one and the same mystery can not take place without great sacrilege.*"† Forty years before, another bishop of Rome, (St.) Leo, (the Great,) had said of the same

* Labb. Conc. xvi. 218.

† Dec. de Cons. dis. 2. c. 12 in Pithou 465.

thing : " With unworthy mouth they receive the body of Christ, but they decline to drink the blood of our redemption at all."*

I will only add these express and decisive words of (St.) Chrysostom : "*Not as it was in the Old Testament when the priest ate some things and the people other things, and it was not lawful for the people to partake of those things of which the priest partook ; it is not so now, but one body and ONE CUP is offered to all.*"†

CHAP. IV.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Has not Christ expressly said, Matt. 26 : 27 : " Drink ye all of this " ?

A. Yes ; but these words were addressed to the *Apostles alone*, and not to all the faithful.

Q. But if the command to drink was here given only to the Apostles, may we not justly conclude that the command to eat also, was given only to the Apostles ?

A. The commands to eat and to drink were on this occasion, both given *only* to the Apostles and their successors ; that is to say, to the bishops and priests of the Church.

Q. How do you prove this ?

A. The command to eat and to drink was given on this occasion only to those to whom it was said, " DO THIS IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME ;" but these latter words were addressed only to the Apostles and their lawful successors in the ministry ; because, by these last words Christ conferred on his ministers the power to consecrate and administer the Eucharist ; and it is quite apparent, that this power was given to the Apostles only, and not to mankind in general, who have never even claimed it.

* Serm. 4, de Quad. c. 5.

† In 2 Cor. Hom. 14. Op. viii. 537.

Q. Is there then no command in this passage, that the laity should receive the Eucharist?

A. Yes; the priests are ordered to distribute it by these words, "Do this in remembrance of me;" and consequently, the laity are commanded to receive it.

Q. At what *precise* moment did Christ utter these words: "Do this in remembrance of me"?

A. St. Luke (chap. 22 : 19) quotes these words as having been uttered by our Lord immediately after he had given the Eucharist to the Apostles under the appearance of bread, and before he had delivered the chalice to them.

Q. What may be learned from this circumstance?

A. That Christ *authorized* his Apostles and their successors to administer the sacrament under the form of bread to the laity, but that he gave no command as regards the chalice.

Q. But does not Christ say, in St. John chap. 7, "*Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye can not have life in you*"?

A. True; but we receive Christ not dead, but alive and immortal, as he is now in heaven; hence, we most certainly receive under either kind both his body and blood, for where his body is, there is his blood, soul, and divinity also. Besides, Protestants have nothing to do with this text on the present question, since they hold, that not only this text, but the whole chapter in which it is found, regard, not the sacrament of the Eucharist, but mere faith in Jesus Christ.

CHAP. IV.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. When our Lord and Saviour in first instituting the Holy Communion said to the Apostles, "Take and eat," "Do this in remembrance of me," and, "Drink ye all of this," did he address them "as bishops and priests of the Church," or as mere *communicants*?

A. Plainly as communicants. The Lord himself was the officiating minister, and they only *received* the sacrament, thus setting the example which all members of the Church after them were to follow.

Q. What reason is there to think that when he said, "Do this in remembrance of me," he meant only (as the Doctrinal Catechism says) to authorize the Apostles (and priests after them) to consecrate the Eucharist for others, and then give them the bread only?

A. None whatever. On the contrary he uttered these words to them, as he gave them the bread, meaning evidently: "Always eat this consecrated bread as a memorial of how I died for you." Just so St. Paul says: "As often as ye do eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come."*

Q. Were these words ever understood in any other sense by the first Christians?

A. No: as is plainly seen in all the oldest liturgies, or forms for celebrating this sacrament.†

Q. What do you think then of the Doctrinal Catechism's bold assertions: 1st, that in these words Christ only gave authority to his ministers to administer this sacrament to others, and that only with the bread; and 2d, that there is no direct command to private Christians to receive it at all, only "the priests are ordered to distribute it, and CONSEQUENTLY the laity are commanded to receive it"! (only it would seem, so that the priests may not have their trouble for nothing)?

A. It must be hard pressed for arguments, and reckless of what excuses it makes, for such a plain departure from the law of our Lord.

CHAP. V.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What would you say, in addition to the above, to an obstinate Protestant who would tell you, that every thing done by Christ at the Last Supper should continue to be practised, and hence, that all should receive under both kinds, because he administered it to all then present?

A. I would tell him: Protestants, in that case, have much to do that they neglect.

* 1 Cor. 11 : 26 : "For as often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until he come."—Douay Bible.

† See even as late as the seventh century, the Mozarabic Missal, Op. Isid. See also 2d Gen. Conc. Const. Lab. viii. 1098. They took this for granted even after the Reformation. See debate between Cranmer and Gardiner, Op. Cram.

Q. What should they do, if all that Christ did, be essentially necessary?

A. They should wash the feet of all that are admitted to the sacrament; they should break the bread; they should make the chalice or cup pass from hand to hand; they should receive the sacrament after supper, and only twelve should sit at the same table.

Q. What if Protestants reply, that these are not essential to the reception of the sacrament?

A. That is just what we say with regard to the reception of both kinds.

Q. Are not both kinds essential to the sacrament?

A. If they were, Christ would not have promised to the reception of one kind all that he promised to him who receives both. And again, if they were, the *pure* Church of the first four centuries, would not have administered one species without the other, as she frequently did.

Q. Why does the Catholic Church administer the sacrament under one kind only?

A. Amongst other reasons, first, because, for the above reasons, it is evidently unnecessary to use both; and, secondly, because many accidents, exposing this most holy sacrament to irreverence (such as spilling the cup) would take place, if the cup were given to all.

Q. Have Protestants made any admissions on this head?

A. Yes; the Confession of Augsburg excuses the Church from any blame in this matter, (p. 235;) and Luther, tom. ii. p. 100, says, "If you go where only one kind is administered, be content with one kind, and don't oppose the great mass of Christians;" and again, tom. iii. p. 274: "If a General Council should order us to receive under both kinds, out of contempt for the Council we should receive only one."

Q. What do you conclude from all we have said?

A. Protestants, in forming their creed, have read the Scripture without studying its meaning.

Q. What other inference would you draw?

A. That the Scripture does not contain every neces-

sary truth clearly laid down ; otherwise, there would be no dispute on this subject.

CHAP. V.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. It is plain then that the Roman Church has made a wide departure from the law of our Lord in regard to this sacrament ; are we guilty in like manner in not observing the *washing of feet*, etc., mentioned in the Doctrinal Catechism ?

A. It is foolish and profane to compare such things with the express command : “ Drink ye all of it.”

Q. Why did the Roman Church make this bold change in the divine law and the universal custom ?

A. It was one of the results of the false doctrine that the bread and wine of the Lord’s Supper were the actual body and blood of Christ. The superstitious fear of spilling that precious blood, led them to confine the use of it to the officiating priest.

Q. What other, if possible, yet more conclusive proof have we that the Roman Church has in this, by its own admission, departed from the commandment of our Lord and Saviour ?

A. It is agreed by all that at the institution of this sacrament the disciples drank of the cup, while it does not appear that *Christ did so* at all. Now in the Roman Communion the officiating minister alone drinks of the cup, and no one of the other communicants, *even though they may be priests or bishops*. This *exactly reverses* the example which our Lord gave us.

Q. What do you say of the pretended “ admissions of Protestants ” quoted in the Doctrinal Catechism ?

A. Those upon whom so great an error in religion has been proved, had better be thinking of more serious things than any body’s “ admissions.”* And now, my friend, you who are reading this, even if you have up to this time supposed that the Roman Church could not go wrong in doctrine, do you not see already that it *has* done so ?

* In fact, however, these are hasty sayings of Luther before he got out of the old errors, as he himself afterwards declared ; and as for the Augsburg Conf., every one who has read it knows that it does not excuse but *solemnly condemns* this shameful breach of our Lord’s commandment.

On the Sacrifice of the Mass.

CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Who is the author of the Mass? Was it instituted by Jesus Christ, or by the Church?

A. Jesus Christ is the author of the essential part, or the sacrifice of his body and blood; the Church has appointed merely the accompanying ceremonial.

Q. Did Jesus Christ offer his body and his blood for us to his Father in the Last Supper?

A. He did, not only upon the cross, but in his Last Supper.

Q. How do you prove this?

A. By the words of Christ himself. In St. Luke, chap. 22, he says: "This is my body which IS GIVEN for you." Mark well his words. He does not say, this is my body, which *shall* be given for you, but which IS now, whilst I speak, given for you. This becomes more evident still, from the words used by Christ, whilst he held the chalice in his hands, and this whether we follow the Catholic or Protestant translation: "This is my blood of the new testament, which is SHED for many for the remission of sins." (Matt. 26 : 28, Prot. Transl.) "For this is my blood of the new testament, which *shall be shed* for many unto remission of sins." (Matt. 26 : 28, Cath. Transl.) St. Mark and St. Luke are equally clear, especially the latter, chap. 22, 20. From these passages, it is quite clear that the chalice contained what was shed for us; but what was shed for us, was the blood of Christ; therefore the chalice contained the blood of Christ. But at the time of the Last Supper, Christ had not yet shed his blood for us in the sacrifice of the cross; therefore he shed it in the sacrifice of his Last Supper; therefore, in his Last Supper, Christ offered in sacrifice his body which was broken, his blood which was shed, for the remission

of our sins ; therefore, he offered a true and real propitiatory sacrifice in his Last Supper.

Q. What follows from this ?

A. If Christ, in his Last Supper, offered a true and real sacrifice of his body and blood, before he offered himself in sacrifice on the cross, it follows, that all the priests of his Church must offer the same sacrifice, because Christ ordered all his ministers to do what he himself had done on that occasion : "*Do this for a commemoration of me.*"

Q. What is the title given by David, in the 109th Psalm, to Jesus Christ ?

A. He styles him a "*Priest forever according to the order of Melchizedeck.*"

Q. Why is he styled "forever a priest, according to the order of Melchizedeck" ?

A. Because, like Melchizedeck, he used bread and wine in the sacrifice.

Q. Why is Christ styled a priest forever after Melchizedeck's order ?

A. Because he continues, and will continue, to offer the same sacrifice by the hands of his priests to the end of the world.

Q. Would Christ be a PRIEST FOREVER *according to the order of Melchizedeck*, if a sacrifice, according to Melchizedeck's order, had been only offered at the Last Supper by himself ?

A. No ; for in that case he would not be a priest forever, but only for once, according to the order of Melchizedeck : to be a *priest forever*, it was necessary he should establish an everlasting order of priests, to offer the same sacrifice, as his substitutes.

Q. Would Christ be a priest, *according to the order of Melchizedeck*, if he had not used bread and wine in a true and real sacrifice in the Last Supper ?

A. No ; for if he did not do so in the Last Supper, he is not a priest at all, according to the order of Melchizedeck, since there is no resemblance between his sacrifice on the cross, and the sacrifice of Melchizedeck ; and if Christ did not at his Last Supper, he never at any other time did, offer a sacrifice similar in any manner to that of Melchizedeck.

Q. What does the prophet Malachy say touching this sacrifice ?

A. "From the *rising* of the sun, even to the *going down* thereof, my name is great among the Gentiles; and in EVERY PLACE there is SACRIFICE, and there is *offered* to my name a *clean oblation*."

Q. Does not Malachy foretell here merely the sacrifice of the cross?

A. No, not that alone; for he speaks of a sacrifice to be offered in *every place*, and the sacrifice of the cross was offered in only *one place* and *for one time*. Hence, there must be a sacrifice of the new law, intimately connected, or identical, with that of the cross, to be offered up in *every place*, which can be no other than the Eucharistic sacrifice.

Q. May not this *clean oblation* be prayer and praise and thanksgiving?

A. No; for this would be nothing new for a prophet to foretell; this sort of oblation was offered to God in every age, even at the time the prophecy was made. Besides, who would dare to say that his *imperfect* prayer was a *clean oblation*? The prophet evidently alludes to some extraordinary *sacrifice*, some new *clean oblation* to come, not *already* existing, which would be substituted for all the sacrifices of the old law, which, in the previous verses, he condemns.

Q. What says the prophet Jeremias on this subject? (Chap. 33 : 18.)

A. "Neither shall there be cut off from the priests and Levites a man before my face, to offer holocausts, and to burn sacrifices, and to kill victims *continually*."

Q. What says St. Paul? (Heb. 5 : 1.)

A. "For every high priest, taken from among men, is ordained for man in things pertaining to God, that he may offer *both gifts* and *sacrifices for sins*;" and elsewhere, he says: "We have an altar of which those who serve the tabernacle dare not eat."

Q. Do you find that these doctrines of the Apostles, or what was foretold of the Christian Church by the prophets, are realized or verified in the Protestant Church?

A. No; for the Protestant Church has no *altar* or *priest*, or *sacrifice*, all of which, according to Scripture, are clearly necessary in the true Christian Church.

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Did our Lord institute "a sacrifice of the new Law called the Mass"?

A. There is no such word as "Mass" in the Holy Scriptures, nor was the word known in the Church until about four hundred years after the Apostles. (For hundreds of years more it did not mean what the Roman Church does now.) No "sacrifice" was offered to God among the first Christians, other than worship, love, and good works.

Q. From what then did the "Mass" as now used in the Roman Church, take its rise?

A. From a wrong idea of the Lord's Supper, or Eucharist, which prevailed by degrees.

Q. What is this sacrament?

A. It is, as we have partially seen in the chapters just before this, a ceremony established by our Redeemer in the Church by which every member of it from time to time makes a solemn memorial of his dying for our redemption.

Q. Is there no spiritual good obtained in this sacrament by a communicant?

A. As this is the highest act of worship and open obedience, and the most solemn profession of Christ which we can make, so our Lord has made it the special *communion* (that is, *union together*) of his people and of him with them, calling it "the communion of his body and blood," and blessing with special grace those who join in it from the heart.

Q. What did he evidently mean when at the Last Supper he gave bread and wine to his disciples saying, "This is my body"—"This is my blood"?

A. It is plain that he meant and was understood by them to say, that this bread and wine represented the sacrifice of himself for the sins of men which he *was about* to make. Remember that he did not actually thus die until *the next day*. If some one who was expecting to lose his life for you on the morrow was sit-

ting with you, and was to say, (taking up some bread and wine,) "This is my body given for you"—"This is my blood shed for you"—"Eat and drink this in remembrance of me"—what would you *know* that he meant by this?

Q. What was the "true and propitiatory sacrifice" by which the remission of sins was obtained for mankind?

A. The death of our Lord Jesus Christ (blessed be his name for evermore!) upon the cross; when he was betrayed by Judas, and condemned by Caiaphas and Pilate 1800 years ago. God says so in many places of his Book, and especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which seems all written to condemn the notion of a "sacrifice of the Mass." Note these plain words: "Nor yet that he should offer himself *often* as the High Priest entereth into the holy place every year with the blood of others, *for then he must often* have suffered since the foundation of the world. But now *ONCE* in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men *once to die*, but after this the judgment; *so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many.*"* "By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ *ONCE FOR ALL*. And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. *But this* man, after he had offered *ONE SACRIFICE* for sins, *forever sat down on the right hand of God.*"† These terms "*once*," and "*once for all*," are applied in this Epistle to Christ's death upon Cal-

* Heb. 9: 25-28: "Nor yet that he should offer himself often as the High Priest entereth into the holies every year with the blood of others, for then he ought to have suffered often from the beginning of the world; but now once at the end of ages he hath appeared for the destruction of sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die and after this the judgment, so also Christ was offered once to exhaust the sins of many."—Douay Bible.

† Heb. 10: 10-12: "In the which will we are sanctified by the oblation of the body of Jesus Christ once. And every priest indeed standeth daily ministering and often offering the same sacrifices which can never take away sins; but this man offering one sacrifice for sins, forever sitteth on the right hand of God."—Douay Bible. No wonder the Roman Church thinks that if men use their private judgment of the Scriptures, they will doubt its doctrines.

vary as a sacrifice for sin, *eleven times*. Thus all the priests and all the sacrifices of the old law (to which he is compared in the holy words just quoted) were but types of this one. When this appeared they were done away; and *after it* no sort of offering for the remission of sins could be made.

Q. Can this be true and the Eucharist be *also* a sacrifice for sins?

A. No; not even upon the pretense of that sacrament's *renewing* and *applying* the great sacrifice, for it was established before the death upon the cross. Now that death could not be "renewed" *the day before it took place*. So plain is this, that the Doctrinal Catechism in one place (p. 150) cunningly withdraws from the ground that "the Mass" is a *renewal* of the sacrifice of the cross, and says that "Christ in his Last Supper offered a true and real sacrifice of his body and blood *BEFORE he offered himself in sacrifice on the cross.*" It afterwards comes back to a *renewal*, (p. .) The first "Mass" then was a *renewal* of something which did not take place *until the next day!*

Q. What titles do we give to our Lord on account of his dying for us?

A. We call him our great and only sacrifice and High Priest, who thus offering himself made *once for all* atonement for our sins.

Q. Shall we deny this plain truth because it is also said of Christ that he is "a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek"? Who was Melchizedek?

A. He was a man in the days of the patriarchs long before the time of Moses and Aaron, who was both a king and a priest. Our Lord, who is both King and Priest, (and of whom Melchizedek, like the Jewish priests, was a *type* or foreshadow,) is therefore compared to him in this.

Q. Is it true, as assumed by the Doctrinal Catechism, that he is thus compared, "because like Melchizedek he used bread and wine in the sacrifice"?

A. *There is not a word of the kind in Scripture.* Read for yourself all that is said of this which you will find in the 7th Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews.*

* See also chap. 5 : 6, 10; 6 : 20. Gen. 14 : 18-20. Ps. 110 : 4.

There is nothing about bread and wine in it. The substance of it all is in these words, (v. 15-17,) "For that after the similitude of Melchizedek there ariseth another priest who is made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life. For he testifieth, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek."* That is, our Lord is, like him, a *royal priest*, reigning "in heaven itself"—"a priest forever," because the memory and the merits of his *one offering* endure forever. As to his being compared to Melchizedek in regard to the offering of bread and wine, you see there is not a word of truth in that; as indeed there is no proof that Melchizedek ever used bread and wine in *any sort of sacrifice*.†

Q. But must we have this "sacrifice of the Mass" because one of the prophets says, "In every place incense shall be offered to my name and pure offering"? ‡

A. Tertullian, one of the earliest Christian writers, (about one hundred years after the Apostles,) gives the plain and natural meaning of these words as follows: "In every place sacrifice is offered to my name, and a clean sacrifice, to wit, SIMPLE PRAYER FROM A PURE CONSCIENCE."§ (Of course *a part* of this worship was the ceremony of the Eucharist, but they did not dream in those times that this meant a "*Mass*, a true propitiatory sacrifice both for the living and the dead.") "No," says the Doctrinal Catechism, "it could not mean *prayer*, etc., for this would be nothing new for a prophet to foretell." Was it nothing new that the true God should thus be worshipped "EVERY WHERE"?

Q. What do you say of the words of Jeremiah and St. Paul about priests, quoted by the Doctrinal Catechism, p. 151?

A. They were plainly speaking of the *Jewish* and not

* "If according to the similitude of Melchizedek there ariseth another priest who is made not according to the law of a carnal commandment, but according to the power of an indissoluble life; for he testifieth thou art a priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek."—Douay Bible.

† For what the first Christians thought of this, see Just. Martyr, adv. Tryph 236, 250, etc.

‡ Mal. 1: 11: "In every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation."—Douay Bible.

§ Adv. Marc. iv. c. 1.

of the Christian law. When St. Paul says, "We have an altar," etc., he compares the *spiritual* worship of Christians to the *ceremonial* worship of the Jews. He says also of Jesus that he "hath an *unchangeable* priesthood;"* which word *unchangeable* means more correctly, in the Greek, *incommunicable*—that can not pass from him to another. He is therefore the *only* priest of his order, in making atonement for sins.

Q. Has the Protestant Church "no altar, or priest, or sacrifice"?

A. It has them all in its one Lord Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God, slain once upon Mount Calvary to take away the sins of the world. It has also priests among men to offer sacrifices of prayer and praise.

CHAP. II.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. How many kinds of sacrifices were there in the old law?

A. There were four: the holocaust, the Eucharistic, the impetratory, and the propitiatory sacrifices.

Q. Why were victims offered in holocaust?

A. To acknowledge the supreme dominion of God over all creatures.

Q. For what purpose was the Eucharistic sacrifice?

A. To thank God for favors and graces received.

Q. For what was the impetratory sacrifice instituted?

A. To obtain from God important benefits or graces.

Q. For what end was the propitiatory sacrifice?

A. To render God propitious, and to expiate sin.

Q. What says St. Augustine, born in 354, in his work on the *City of God*, written about fourteen hundred years ago?

A. That the one sacrifice of the Mass was instituted to hold the place of all the sacrifices of the old law.

Q. What says St. Ireneus? (Lib iv. chap. 33.)

A. "The Apostles received this sacrifice from Christ, the Church from the Apostles, and she offers it every

* Heb. 7: 24: "An everlasting priesthood."—Douay Bible.

where, according to the prophecy of Malachy: '*And in every place a pure sacrifice shall be offered.*'"

Q. Has the sacrifice of the Mass been offered every where during the last two hundred years?

A. Yes; in every Christian country of the earth.

Q. Has it been every where offered during the last twelve hundred years?

A. Yes; as all the ancient liturgies—Latin, Greek, Arabic, etc.—attest.

Q. Can any one point out the first priest, bishop, or Pope, who said Mass, or the time or country in which this first Mass was said?

A. No; no man has ever been able to make such a discovery.

Q. What follows from this?

A. It follows by St. Augustine's rule, that we have received the Mass from Christ and his Apostles, since, if it were the invention of man, it could be traced to its author; for, says that Father, whatever is *universally* believed and practised in the Church, and can not be traced to any bishop, or Pope, or council, as its author, must have been taught and practised by the Apostles.

Q. Give me another authority, from the many Fathers who assure us, that the pure Christian Church of the earliest ages admitted the Mass as a true sacrifice?

A. St. Cyprian (Epist. 78) says: "Jesus Christ offered the same *sacrifice* as did Melchizedeck, that is, bread and wine, his *own body and blood*. . . . If Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, be himself the high priest of his Father, and if he first offered himself as a sacrifice to him, and commanded the same to be done in remembrance of him, then that priest truly stands in the place of Christ, *who does* what *Christ did*, and offers in the Church a new and complete sacrifice to God the Father, doing what he ordained."

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Can the sacrament of the Holy Communion be properly called *a sacrifice*?

A. Yes, in the sense in which *all our service and worship* of God is sacrifice or offering, this being *the greatest act of worship*, and also a perpetual memorial of the great *atoning* sacrifice of our Lord; but it is no such *sacrifice for sins* as that was.

Q. Did the early Christians so speak of it?

A. Yes, and only so. Thus Justin Martyr (forty years after the Apostles) says: "I pronounce the only sacrifices which are perfect and acceptable to God to be the *prayers* and *thanksgivings* which are made by the righteous. For the Christians have learned to make such offerings alone, even in their commemoration of the solid and liquid food in which they commemorate the sufferings which the Son of God bore for us."* So also, Clement of Alexandria, (forty years later :) "The sacrifices of God are prayer and praises, and reading of the Scriptures before meals, and psalms and hymns during meals, and at bed-time and in the night."† (It is a remarkable fact that the Jews and heathens in those days made the same objection to the Christians which the Roman Church does now to the Reformed; that they had no visible and showy sacrifices in their worship; and the Christians said in reply, as we do, that the sacrifices of their worship were only spiritual. (See *Min. Fel.* Oct. ix.—*Tertullian* adv. Jud. v. etc.)

Q. What of the passages quoted from "the Fathers" by the Doctrinal Catechism in favor of "the Mass"?

A. If these were fair and genuine, they could not prove what is so plainly against Holy Scripture. But they are *unfairly* and even *falsely* quoted.

Q. Show this in one instance?

A. The Doctrinal Catechism has just told us that: "St. Augustine says in his work on the '*City of God*,' that the

* Dial, cont. Tryph. 117.

† Strom. vii. c. 7, p. 860.

one sacrifice of the Mass was instituted to hold the place of all the sacrifices of the Old Law." Now, the word "Mass" can not be found in this whole book of Augustine, and indeed, was not used in his day to describe the Eucharist at all. *There is a chapter in this book "on the TRUE AND PERFECT SACRIFICE,"* (which begins thus: "*The true sacrifice is every work which is done that we may adhere to God in a holy fellowship.*") In this chapter (nor in the whole book) not even the substance of what the Doctrinal Catechism pretends to quote can be found. But it *does* contain this sentence: "For this form he took upon him, in this he was offered, according to this he is our Mediator, in this he is our Priest, in this he is a Sacrifice. And therefore the Apostle exhorts us that 'we render our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is our reasonable service;' that we are *ourselves* a well-pleasing, and perfect, and entire *sacrifice*. THIS IS THE SACRIFICE OF CHRISTIANS: many, one body in Christ."*

Q. When did this notion of a "true and propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass" arise?

A. The growth and unfolding of this error (as of many others) was very slow. Some superstitions in regard to the Lord's Supper began to creep into the Church early, (even before Augustine's time,) without being noticed by the best men. But they did not ripen into this enormous error until about five or six hundred years after the Apostles. (See the table, at page 000.)

CHAP. III.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Is the sacrifice of the Mass a true propitiatory sacrifice?

A. Yes; both for the living and the dead.

Q. In what sense is it a propitiatory sacrifice for the living?

A. In this, that through it they obtain the spirit of compunction and grace to repent of their sins.

* De Civ. Dei. x. 6.

Q. How is it propitiatory for the dead ?

A. It contributes to the remission of the temporal punishment,* which they may still owe to the Divine Justice.

Q. How do you prove that the Mass is truly a propitiatory sacrifice ?

A. From St. Matt. chap. 26, "This is my blood of the new testament, which *is shed* for many *for the remission of sins*," and from St. Paul to the Hebrews, chap. 5: "For every high priest, taken from among men, is ordained for men in the things that appertain to God, that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins."

Q. What do you conclude from these ?

A. That as we certainly have, in the Christian Church, a high priest, so his duty certainly is to offer sacrifices for sins.

Q. Is there, then, more than one sacrifice propitiatory or expiatory ? Has not the sacrifice of the cross alone expiated all sin ?

A. The sacrifice of the cross and the sacrifice of the altar, are one and the same.

Q. Why, then, renew every day the same sacrifice ? is not the sacrifice of the cross once offered sufficient ?

A. The merits and virtue of the sacrifice of the cross are infinite ; but that virtue and these merits must be applied, and this can only be done by certain means.

Q. What are these means by which the merits of the sacrifice of the cross are applied to our souls ?

A. They are the sacraments, the sacrifice of the Mass, prayer, and good works.

Q. Amongst these means, in what light are we to regard the sacrifice of the Mass ?

A. We are to regard it as a means employed by the Almighty, for applying the sacred merits of the sacrifice of the cross to our souls, in a very particular manner.

Q. Has the sacrifice of the Mass been offered for the dead since the earliest ages ?

A. Yes ; as is evident from the testimony of the early Fathers and writers. Tertullian, lib. de Monog.,

* See Treatise on Indulgences.

says: "That a woman who would not have the holy sacrifice of the Mass celebrated every year for her husband on the anniversary of his death, should be considered as one who had been divorced from him." St. Cyprian, Epist. 9, says: "Our predecessors prudently advised, that no brother departing this life should nominate any churchman his executor; and, should he do it, that no *oblation* should be made for him, nor *sacrifice offered* for his repose." The Council of Chalons (anno 579) decrees, that in all solemn Masses, prayers be offered up for the souls of the departed. In fine, St. Augustine, lib. xxii. de Civit. Dei, tells us: "That one of his priests celebrated Mass in a house infested by evil spirits, and that by this their banishment was effected."

CHAP. III.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Do you need the forgiveness of God?

A. I do indeed, for I am a miserable sinner.

Q. How can you obtain it? Can any sacrifice be made for your sins? or has any been made?

A. Yes: "Jesus Christ the Son of God suffered death upon the cross for my redemption, who made there by his own oblation of himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."

Q. How can *you*, for the salvation of *your* soul, avail yourself of the most precious merits and death of Christ?

A. By truly repenting of my sins, believing on him in my soul, joining his people, and devoting myself to his love and service. When one asked a holy Apostle, "What must I do to be saved?" he replied: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved."*

Q. Is it necessary, then, that the sacrifice of Calvary should be repeated in "the Mass"?

A. It is amazing that any one should say so when

* Acts 16 : 30, 31 : "What must I do that I may be saved? But they said, Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved."—Douay Bible.

GOD has said, "*Nor yet that he should offer himself often,*" and, "*But this man after he had offered ONE SACRIFICE for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God,*" (see page 153;) unless he was one of those, who, according to St. Paul, in this same Epistle, "crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh and put him to an open shame." (6 : 6.)

Q. What *has* the Eucharist to do with the sacrifice of the Cross?

A. It is our *celebrating the memory* of that sacrifice: as (St.) Augustine says about what had become a common custom in his day, of calling this sacrament, *the sacrifice*; "that which is called by men a sacrifice, is a *sign* of the true sacrifice."*

Q. Can this superstition of "the Mass" do any harm?

A. It is not only wrong, but also dangerous to *add* any thing in our religion to what *God has told us*. "The Mass" is a strong instance of this. By it men are tempted to rely for salvation upon what a priest does, that is, upon something beside the mercy of God in our Lord and Saviour; and, even worse, may be snared by the dreadful delusion of thinking, that even if they *die* without pardon, masses said for their souls can yet save them.

Q. What do you say, then, of the Protestant and Roman Churches in regard to this?

A. The former is right in calling the notion of "*the Mass,*" a blasphemous fable, and dangerous deceit; while the latter, in retaining it, and calling it "*the soul of religion,*" has departed far from pure religion.

* De Civ. Dei. x. 5.

On Purgatory.

CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. How do you prove that there is a Purgatory, or middle state between hell and heaven?

A. It is proved, 1st, from the Old Testament; 2dly, from the New Testament; and, 3dly, from tradition.

Q. What is your proof from the Old Testament?

A. In 2d Machab. chap. 12, where Judas, the valiant commander, collects and sends to Jerusalem twelve thousand drachmas of silver, for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead. "It is therefore," says this passage, "a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins."

Q. What do you conclude from this passage?

A. That besides heaven and hell there is a middle state; because, as the souls in heaven require not the aid of prayer, so the souls in hell can receive no benefit from it; hence, there must be some third state of souls, in which prayer is beneficial to them.

Q. But is this book of Machabees a canonical book, containing God's word?

A. It has been recognized as such from the earliest ages. St. Augustine (*Civit. Dei*, chap. 36) says: "The Church of God has always acknowledged the Machabees as a canonical book." Protestants have rejected this book, like many other books of Scripture, because it contains doctrines opposed to their novel inventions. They do not seem to reflect, that it is on the authority of the Catholic Church they know the Scriptures which they admit to be God's word, and they have that authority for this book as well as for the rest.

Q. Does not the author of Machabees make an apology for the errors it contains?

A. Yes; for errors of *style*, but not for errors in fact or doctrine. See, for another argument on this subject of Purgatory, Gen. 37 : 33.

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. How are we taught in the Gospel to regard death and all that follows it?

A. With humble peace, hope, and joy, if we are honest Christians, however imperfect; for “the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin,”* and, “Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord;”† but if not Christians in heart, then with great fear, for “it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God,”‡ and, “fear him who after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell.”§

Q. What must we say then of the notion that most *Christians* have to suffer the same torments as those of hell after they die—no one knows how long—before they can be pure and happy?

A. It is a frightful error about one of the greatest matters of religion, namely, our thoughts of the life to come.

Q. What does the Roman Church teach about departed souls?

A. That they are divided among five or more different places, namely: *Heaven*, where the perfect Christians, or “saints” are; *Purgatory*, where the imperfect Christians are, having their sins burned out of them by tormenting fire like that of Hell;|| *Hell* itself, where all other men are, (including all Protestants, since according to that Church they are no Christians at all;) and

* 1 John 1 : 7. So also the Douay Bible, as also in all the following passages.

† Rev. 14 : 13.

‡ Heb. 10 : 31.

§ Luke 12 : 5.

|| That I may do no injustice to this doctrine, I quote from Card. Bellarmine: “The least pains of purgatory are greater than the greatest of this life—the same as of hell, only not eternal.” (De Purg. ii. 14. iv. 1. Also De Gem. Col. 2 : 9.) After relating a story found in the life of (St.) Ludgardis, about Pope Innocent III. coming to her from Purgatory “encircled with a vast flame,” and telling her about his torments there, he goes on to say: “This instance always affects me with the greatest terror. For if a pontiff entitled to so much praise, one who to all human observation was not merely a man of integrity and prudence but of eminent, nay most exemplary sanctity, if even he so narrowly escaped hell, and, as it is, must suffer the most excruciating torments till the day of judgment, what prelate is there who does not tremble?”

at least two other places, one for the Old Testament worthies, called "*Limbus Patrum*," and the other for infant children, called "*Limbus Infantum*."

Q. Does the word of God tell us of such a "Purgatory," or of either "Limbus"?

A. No; neither in the Old or New Testaments. These words and the notions themselves were invented by men in the Dark Ages.

Q. What do you say of the quotation from "2 Machabees"?

A. That, supposing it mentioned "Purgatory," (which it does not,) that book is a common human writing not to be mentioned with the word of God.

Q. But the Doctrinal Catechism says, "It has been recognized as a canonical book from the earliest ages"?

A. This is untrue; and here is one among many proofs that it is so. (St.) Jerome, the greatest scholar of his time, 300 years after the Apostles (his Latin translation of the Scriptures, the "Vulgate," is the official Bible of the Roman Church) says of the books of Maccabees and certain others which that Church now pretends to be divine: "*The Church does not receive them among the CANONICAL BOOKS.*"* We are also referred to Gen. 37 : 33 (35 ?) *Look at that for yourself*, and see if it tells about "Purgatory."

CHAP. II.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. How do you prove from the New Testament that there is a Purgatory?

A. From Matthew, chap. 12 : "Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him; *neither* in this world, *neither* in the world to come."

Q. What inference does St. Augustine draw from this passage? (Civit. Dei, chap. xiv. lib. 21.)

A. That some sins are forgiven in the next world,

* Op. iii. 18.

otherwise this passage of Scripture would be nonsense. Now sins are not remitted in heaven, for no sin can enter there; nor in hell, for there is no redemption from that awful abode: therefore there must be some third place, where some sins are forgiven.

Q. Cite the words of St. Paul? (1 Cor. chap. 3.)

A. "And the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide . . . he shall receive a reward; if any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire."

Q. What on this do you remark?

A. There can be no pain, or suffering, or fire in heaven; nor is the fire of hell for salvation, but damnation: therefore this fire, which worketh unto salvation, must be in Purgatory.

Q. What says the same Apostle? (Philip. 2 : 10.)

A. "That, at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, of those that are in heaven, on earth, and under the earth."

Q. How do you reason on this?

A. By those under the earth, are evidently meant, not the dead bodies, but the souls of the dead not yet in heaven. Now these souls are certainly either in hell or in Purgatory, or in both. But St. Paul can not allude to those in hell, for he knew well that they would not bow the knee to Jesus; therefore he must allude to souls in some other place, which is not heaven, or earth, or the hell of the damned; therefore that place exists, and it is that which Catholics call Purgatory.

Q. What does St. John say (Apoc. 21 : 27) of Heaven?

A. "And there shall not enter into it any thing defiled."

Q. What do you conclude from this?

A. That there must be some place for the purification of souls after death; because the Scripture assures us, that even *the just man* falls seven times; and can any one in his senses suppose that many will not die without expiating these faults? With these they can not enter heaven, which receiveth nothing defiled; they

can not be sent to hell, for they are, according to Scripture, JUST. Therefore there must be a third place, where these failings of even the just man will be expiated. See also 1 Cor. 15 : 29 ; 2 Tim. 1 : 18, where St. Paul prays for Onesiphorus after he was dead.

Q. Did any one ascend to heaven before our Saviour ?

A. No ; for in St. John 3 : 13, Christ says : " No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven."

Q. Where then were all the just souls of the Old Testament until Christ's ascension ?

A. They were not in heaven, they were not in hell, therefore they were in some middle place or state.

Q. What is the meaning of that passage in 1 Peter 3 : 18, which says, that Christ *went and preached unto the spirits in prison* ? Where were these spirits ?

A. They were not in heaven, for there they would require no preaching ; they were not in hell, for there preaching could be of no use to them ; therefore they were in some middle state where the souls of the just were awaiting the coming of the Redeemer, by whom the gates of heaven were to be reöpened, and they admitted into the presence of God.

Q. Does not the Scripture say, that as the tree falls so it shall lie ?

A. Yes ; but this means, simply, that every man who dies, is either saved or lost ; and it may also refer to the state of the soul after the last judgment. The moment man dies, his ultimate fate is decided, either for the south or the north, for heaven or hell.

Q. Is it not said, (Apoc. 14,) " Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord, for they shall rest from their labors " ?

A. Yes ; thrice blessed, we say ; but this text only alludes to martyrs, and such as die free from all sin and debt of temporal punishment, and such, of course, require not purification. They really die in the Lord.

Q. Does not Christ say to the good thief, " This day thou shalt be with me in paradise " ?

A. Yes ; but it is not clear, that by paradise, is here meant heaven and not Purgatory ; and even if this were clear, a miracle of God's grace, wrought in favor of a

penitent on the *very day the world was redeemed*, is not to be considered as God's general rule with regard to sinners. In fine, the good thief suffered much on the cross, and Christ might have received his patient sufferings there as his purgatorial expiation.

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What do you remark in general of the passages quoted from the New Testament to prove that there is a "Purgatory"?

A. That *they do not contain the word "Purgatory" at all*; and if they mean the thing, it is strange that they were not so understood among the first Christians; whereas, (as we shall soon see,) the present doctrine of the Roman Church, and *the very term "Purgatory,"* were not known for 500 years after the Apostles.

Q. What do you say of the passage from St. Matthew, chap. 12?

A. It does *not* follow from this that "some sins are forgiven in the world to come:" it is a very strong way of saying that this sin *never* is forgiven, not even in this world; as (St.) Fulgentius, who lived just after Augustine, says: "By these words our Lord and Saviour *did not intimate* that any sins will be forgiven in the world to come which have not been forgiven in this life."* (Even the Roman Church does not say [though the Doctrinal Catechism ventures to] that sin is forgiven in "Purgatory:" but only that the filthiness of it is purged out by fire and its punishment finished.†)

Q. What of St. Paul's words, "The fire shall try," etc., 1 Cor. 3?

A. To show that we may easily explain this without fancying a "Purgatory," I quote (St.) Augustine's explanation of it: "There is a certain fire, *the trial of tribulation*, of which it is plainly written in another place: 'The furnace proves the vessel of the potter, and the trial of tribulation proves the just.' This fire *in the*

* De Rem. Pecc. i. 24.

† See Cat. of Counc. of Trent, 10th Art. of Creed.

present life performs what the Apostle says, if it happens to two believing men," etc.*

Q. What of the same Apostle's words, "That at the name of Jesus," etc.?

A. They *do* plainly mean all creatures whatever, in earth, heaven, hell, or any where else.

Q. What of the words, "There shall in nowise enter into it any thing that defileth," etc.?

A. Though my "sins be as scarlet," my Saviour *can* make me "as white as snow" the moment I die, and so "meet to be a partaker of the inheritance of the saints." Look well at this: "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from *all sin*." That is, "cleansing" enough without fancying a "purgatorial fire."

Q. But *did* St. Paul pray for Onesiphorus after he was dead?

A. *There is not the slightest reason* to suppose that Onesiphorus was *dead* at the time. To *assume* that he was, (as the Doctrinal Catechism coolly does,) shows how weak the cause is which needs such an artifice to sustain it.

Q. What of the words, "No man hath ascended up to heaven," etc.?

A. Here is the whole passage. It is a part of what our Lord said to the doubting Nicodemus about the "new birth," (and not about *departed souls* at all.) "If I have told you earthly things and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things? And no man hath ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven," etc.† That is: "No man has gone up to heaven and brought back here an account of heavenly things. You can know them only from me who came down from there." Does this tell of a fiery "Purgatory"? Abraham, one of "the just souls of the Old Testament," we know positively (see Luke 14) was then happy with Lazarus, and in no such horrid place!

* Op. vi. 93-4.

† John 3: 13: "If I have spoken to you earthly things and you believe not, how will you believe if I shall speak to you heavenly things? And no man hath ascended into heaven but he that descended from heaven," etc.—Douay Bible.

Q. But what of the "spirits in prison," etc.?

A. There are various explanations given of this mysterious passage.* But one thing clearly it does *not* say, namely, that there is a dreadful fiery place of "Purgatory" for all Christians except perfect saints. If there is such a place, it is so important to men to know it, (*for those who believe in it make it a great part of their religion*,) that God would have told us so plainly. Look at this well. Why is not the Roman Church able to cite from Scripture for this great part of its religion some such words as this, "There is a Purgatory," etc.?

Q. What then do you say of the way in which the Doctrinal Catechism evades those plain passages of Scripture which say that the souls of *all* our Lord Christ's people *are* happy after death?

A. This too shows the badness of its cause. To assert without the least proof or argument that those "who die in the Lord" are "only martyrs," etc., and to suggest that PARADISE means PURGATORY, are devices worthy of its doctrine.

CHAP. III.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What is your third mode of proving that there is a Purgatory?

A. By tradition, or the unanimous testimony of the Fathers.

Q. Was all antiquity of the belief that there is a Purgatory?

A. The third Council of Carthage, anno 253, decreed prayers for the dead. The Council of Chalons in 579, the Council of Worms in 829, and the Council of Trent, all came to the same decision.

Q. Are the Ancient Fathers unanimous on this question?

A. You have only to consult *Berrington's and Kirk's Faith of Catholics*, to be satisfied that they are most unanimous. St. Ephrem orders prayers for the repose of his soul after his death. The Emperor Constantine

* The most probable is, I think, that it means all the preaching before the flood to those who were awaiting that great destruction in careless unbelief and impenitence.

wished to be buried in a church, that the faithful might remember him in their prayers to God. St. Chrysostom, in his 1 Hom. on 1 Epist. to Corinth. says: "The tears of the living are not useless to the dead—that prayers and alms relieve them." St. Jerom, in his Epistle to Pammachius, remarks: "It is customary to strew with flowers the graves of the female dead, but you have followed a better usage in strewing the grave of your wife with alms for the solace of her soul." St. Augustine, in 13th chap. of his 9th Book of Confession, says: "I shed not a tear, whilst they offered the holy sacrifice for the peace of my dear mother's soul." On the 37th Psalm, he prays thus, "Purify me, O Lord, in this life, that I may not require the application of that fire, by which souls are tried, in the next;" and, in his Work on the Heresies, (Heresy 53,) he says: "Aerius was the first who dared to teach, that it was of no use to offer up prayers and sacrifices for the dead, and this doctrine of Aerius is the fifty-third heresy."

Q. Does it follow, from the circumstance that the ancient Church prayed for the dead, that there is a Purgatory?

A. Certainly; if the Church always prayed for the dead, she believed the dead were in a place where prayer could be beneficial to them; this place was not heaven, nor could it be hell, therefore it was Purgatory.

CHAP. III.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What shall we say of the confident appeal in behalf of "Purgatory" to "tradition or the unanimous consent of the Fathers" ?*

A. The word of God, as we have seen, speaks for itself so plainly that no men's explanations or opinions are needed. But to show the truth about "the Fathers," I quote the words of certain writers of the Roman Church, the famous and learned Benedictine

* The Doctrinal Catechism refers you (let us hope ignorantly) to a book ("Berrington and Kirk's," etc.,) which has been shown to be crammed with unfair and false quotations from the Fathers. (See Palmer on Romanism.)

monks, of whose studies that Church boasts much. "It is not surprising that Ambrose should have written as he has about the state of departed souls, but it seems to be almost incredible *how uncertain and how various* the holy Fathers have been upon the same question *from the very times of the Apostles* to the Pontificate of Gregory XI., that is, the period of *almost fourteen hundred years*. For NOT ONLY DOES ONE FATHER DIFFER FROM ANOTHER, as in questions not yet defined by the Church was likely to happen, but THEY ARE NOT EVEN FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THEMSELVES."*

Q. What was the cause of this inconsistency?

A. The *growth by degrees* of this false doctrine of "Purgatory." One of the *first* departures of the early Christians, from the simple truth of the Apostles, was in making prayers for their departed brethren, not because they thought them in torment, but as an affectionate and pious way of calling them to mind. *They included the Apostles, and St. Mary, the mother of our Lord, in these prayers for three hundred years.* Did they suppose *them* to be in tormenting fires of "Purgatory"? Yet this was a rather harmless error so far. However, it ripened afterward into the idea that the departed could be released from some distress by these prayers. This is all that the *genuine* passages which the Doctrinal Catechism cites from Augustine and others, mean. Finally in the Dark Ages it came to this, that (as we have already seen, p. 138,) they prayed *to* the most famous saints, and prayed *for* all others that they might be delivered out of a place where they were being purified by tormenting fires; which place they called "Purgatory."

How gradually this change came about will appear from this, that while *prayers for the dead* began in the way we have just described within a hundred years after the Apostles, it was several centuries more before the doctrine of "Purgatory" was established.† Thus

* Op. Amb. I. De Bon. Mort. 535.

† See the table at p. . . A notion much like this *had* long existed among the heathen. See Virg. Æneid, etc.

we find (St.) Cyprian, one hundred and fifty years after the Apostles saying : “ *When we depart hence there is no more place for penitence, NO MORE EFFECT OF SATISFACTION.*”* One hundred and fifty years later, (St.) Augustine, after explaining St. Paul’s words about “the day of the Lord,” etc., as we have quoted before, (p. 168,) goes on to say doubtfully, as of a new opinion : “It is *not incredible* that something of the same kind may take place also after this life, and whether it be so, may be *a matter of inquiry*. That some of the faithful are saved through a certain purgatorial fire more slowly or more speedily according to their greater or less love for perishable goods, *may* be discovered, or *may* not.”† The same Father says elsewhere : “WHOEVER FINISHES THIS LIFE CAN HAVE NOTHING AFTER IT EXCEPT WHAT HE MERITED IN IT.”‡

Q. In what two things is this superstition of “Purgatory” most pernicious?

A. First, In making the worldly more careless; because they think that though they miss heaven, they will not fall into hell, but into this middle place; and, secondly, by making the more devout look to the other life with horror and reluctance, instead of with peace and hope, as all Christians should.

Q. What further wrong is done by this false notion?

A. The making survivors pay large sums of money to priests, etc., for prayers, “masses,” and “indulgences,” in behalf of departed souls believed to be suffering in “Purgatory,” from which they are told these things will release them.

* Lib. ad Demet. 563. † Op. vi. 93. De Oct. Dulc. Quæst. xi.

‡ Op. v. 576.

On Justification.

CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM

Q. What is justification ?

A. It is a grace which makes us friends of God.

Q. Can a sinner merit this justifying grace ?

A. No, he can not ; because all the good works which the sinner performs whilst he is in a state of mortal sin, are *dead works*, which have no merit sufficient to justify.

Q. Is it an article of the Catholic faith, that the sinner, in mortal sin, can not merit the grace of justification ?

A. Yes ; it is decreed in the seventh chapter of the sixth sess. of the Council of Trent, that neither faith, nor good works, preceding justification, can merit the grace of justification.

Q. How then is the sinner justified ?

A. He is justified gratuitously by the pure mercy of God, not on account of his own or any human merit, but purely through the merits of Jesus Christ ; for Jesus Christ is our only mediator of redemption, who alone, by his passion and death, has reconciled us to his Father.

Q. Why then do Protestants charge us with believing that the sinner can merit the remission of his sins ?

A. Their ignorance of the Catholic doctrine is the cause of this, as well as many other false charges.

Q. Must we then conclude, that the sinner can not, by good works, obtain the grace of justification ?

A. The sinner may *obtain* the graces of justification by good works proceeding from a broken and penitent heart, because these are necessary predispositions and conditions, but no works of his own can ever MERIT the grace of justification.

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What is *justification* ?

A. It is being pardoned by God and restored to his love, so that we are treated by him as if we had never sinned.

Q. *Can* we thus be justified ; and how ?

A. Jesus, our Lord and Saviour, died for us that God “might be just, and the justifier of him *who believeth* in Jesus.”* It is then only by a penitent and obedient *faith* in Jesus, that we can thus be *justified*, as St. Paul says again : “Being *justified by faith*, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.”†

Q. Does the Roman Church hold only this pure and true doctrine ?

A. We should be glad to think so, as it is of vast importance to the salvation of men ; yet we fear that many of its zealous members do not so understand it.

Q. What is there which looks like this ?

A. Their making so much in their religion of “saints,” sacraments, and ceremonies ; their “penances,” their “sacrifice of the mass,” their superstition of “Purgatory,” and belief in “indulgences,” their “satisfying for one another,” and their secret priestly confession and absolution. With all this, men will be almost sure to think that *they* can make some atonement to God for their sins. So they will not put *their whole trust* in the merits and death of our Lord.

CHAP. II.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What part has faith in the justification of the sinner ?

A. It is its root or foundation, the first step to its attainment, an all-necessary condition, without which

* Rom. 3 : 26 : “May be just and the justifier of him who is of the faith of Jesus Christ.”—Douay Bible.

† Rom. 5 : 1 : “Being justified therefore by faith, let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.”—Douay Bible.

no man can ever be justified; because the Apostle says: "*Without faith, it is impossible to please God.*"

Q. But is faith alone sufficient to justify the sinner?

A. No; God requires other dispositions in order to the reception of justifying grace. He requires the sinner to fear God, to love God, to hope in God, to be sorry for past sin, and to have a well-grounded purpose not to sin again.

Q. Does God require these as necessary conditions, or as meritorious works?

A. As necessary conditions, without which he will not receive the sinner in grace.

Q. What do the Scriptures say on this subject?

A. "And when thou shalt seek there the Lord thy God, thou shalt find him; yet so, if thou seek him with all thy heart and all the affliction of thy soul." (Deut. 4 : 29.) "But if the wicked man do penance for all his sins which he hath committed, and keep all my commandments and do judgment and justice, living, he shall live, and shall not die." (Ezek. 18 : 21.) "*If you keep my commandment, you shall abide in my love; . . . you are my friends, if you do the things that I command you.*" (John 15 : 10, 14.)

Q. What do you conclude from these passages?

A. In the first place, that the sinner can never be justified, unless he comply with these necessary conditions; and, secondly, that faith alone is not sufficient to justify him.

Q. Does not the Baptist say, John 3 : 36, "He that believeth in the Son hath life everlasting"?

A. Yes; but St. John speaks here of efficacious faith, that is, he who believeth in the Son, so as to believe all that he teaches and practise all that he commands, shall have everlasting life.

Q. Does not St. Paul, Rom. 3 : 28, say, "We account a man to be justified by faith, without the works of the law"?

A. True, but St. Paul is speaking here of the *Jewish*, not the Christian law; for St. Paul can not contradict St. James. Now, St. James says, in words about which there can be no dispute, chap. 2 : 22, 24, "Seest

thou that faith did coöperate with his works, and by works, faith was made perfect : do you see, that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only ;” and, ver. 26, he adds : “ For even as the body without the spirit is dead, so also faith without works is dead.”

Q. Does not St. Paul, Rom. 5 : 1, say, “ Being justified therefore by faith, let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ ” ?

A. Yes ; but the same St. Paul, 1 Corinth. chap. 13 : 1, 2, says : “ If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as a sounding brass ; and if I should have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and *have not charity*, I am nothing.” So that it is quite clear the Apostle speaks, in the passage quoted, of that lively faith, animated by charity, which is ever producing good works.

Q. Protestants suppose, that good works are the necessary effect of faith, as heat is of fire, or light of the sun : is this supposition correct ?

A. No ; for St. John 12 : 42, says : “ Many of the chief men also BELIEVED in him ; but because of the Pharisees, *they did NOT CONFESS him* ; for they loved the glory of men more than the glory of God.”

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Are we told in the Word of God that in order to be justified we must first do some good works “ *to obtain* this grace ” ?

A. No. When one asks, “ What he must do to be saved,” the answer is simply, “ Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.”*

Q. Is this the sort of *belief* which those “ chief men ” had who “ believed in him but did not confess him ” ?

A. Evidently not. That was a mere *opinion* that he was the Messiah. This is a living *trust* or “ *faith which works by love*.”† It implies repentance for sins, and an

* Acts 16 : 30, 31 : “ What must I do that I may be saved ? Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved.—Douay Bible.

† Gal. 5 : 6 : “ Faith that worketh by charity.”—Douay Bible.

honest purpose to love God and keep his commandments.

Q. Does this fairly agree with all the passages of Scripture quoted by the Doctrinal Catechism for the necessity of good works?

A. Perfectly.

Q. What then do you think of the statement that "the sinner may *obtain* the grace of justification by good works," etc.?

A. If it means any thing more than I have said above, it is a departure from the Gospel of our Lord. God pardons us of his *free mercy*, and we obtain that mercy by this honest *faith in it*.

CHAP. III.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Can any one, who is in a state of mortal sin, merit heaven by any good work or works?

A. No; he can neither merit justification, nor heaven; because, all the works he performs while in a state of mortal sin are dead works, and of course have no merit.

Q. Can one who is in a state of grace merit heaven?

A. The just who are in a state of grace, may, by good works, merit an increase of glory, but even they can never, by any or every good work, merit the *first degree* of glory, that is, a right to heaven.

Q. To whom do we owe our permission to enter heaven?

A. Solely to the mercy of God and the merits of Jesus Christ: for it is by the sufferings and death of Jesus that we acquired heaven as our inheritance; and it is God's mercy alone, which gave us such a Mediator and Redeemer.

Q. Why have you said that the just may, by good works, merit an increase of glory in heaven?

A. Because, in Scripture, heaven is proposed to us as a recompense, and a recompense or reward is due only to merit.

Q. What does St. Matthew say on this matter? (Chap. 5: 12.)

A. "Be glad and rejoice, for your reward is very

great in heaven." In Prov. 11 : 18 : " But to him that soweth in justice, there is a faithful reward." St. James 1 : 12 : " Blessed is the man that endureth temptation, for when he hath been proved, he shall receive the crown of life, which God hath promised to them that love him." St. Paul, 2 Tim. 4 : 7, adds : " I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith ; as to the rest, there is laid up for me a crown of justice, which the Lord, the just judge, will render to me in that day."

Q. What have Protestants to object against this Scriptural doctrine ?

A. Nothing that is either rational or Scriptural ; for the learned among themselves have taught the very same. The *Apology for the Protestant Confession of Augsburg*, p. 96, says : " We teach that good works merit a temporal and spiritual reward in this world, as well as in the next."

Q. What then have Protestants to say to Catholics on the subject of merit and good works ?

A. All they have to say arises from their ignorance of the Catholic doctrine.

CHAP. III.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Is there any distinction made in the word of God between " being in mortal sin," and being in some other kind of sin ?

A. None whatever ; the only distinction of men made is between " the world," on the one side, and " the people of God," the true believers in Christ, on the other.

Q. Can the people of God *merit* any thing of him ?

A. No. His words are express : " When ye have DONE ALL, say, We are unprofitable servants."*

Q. What will you say then of the *rewards* which he promises in heaven to faithful service here ?

A. They are, like pardon and eternal life itself, mere

* Luke 17 : 10 : " When ye shall have done all these things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants."—Douay Bible.

bounties, which he tells us of, to move our dull, cold hearts to more love and zeal for him. It would be most ungrateful and presumptuous in us, because God graciously offers such undeserved rewards to claim them as *obtained by our merits*.

Q. Does the Protestant Church teach that we *merit* these good things?

A. No.

CHAP. IV.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What is that which gives their value to good works?

A. Sanctifying grace, which is within us.

Q. Is this sanctifying grace our own, or is it from God?

A. It is the pure gift of God's liberality to us.

Q. How does St. Paul express himself on this subject? (Rom. 5: 3.)

A. "The charity of God," he says, "is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, who is given to us."

Q. What are the effects of sanctifying grace?

A. It makes us the friends and children of God.

Q. To whom do we owe this inestimable grace?

A. To the merits of Jesus Christ, and to these alone.

Q. Have you any thing to remark on the efficacy of the merits of Christ?

A. Yes; he was not satisfied with meriting heaven for us; he also, by his grace, put us in a condition to merit greater degrees of glory in heaven.

Q. Does not our Saviour say, Luke 17: 10, "So you also, when you shall have done all those things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants"?

A. This is quite in accordance with our doctrine; we are certainly unprofitable servants to God, whatever good we do; for nothing which we can do, either adds to, or takes from, his essential glory. We are not, however, unprofitable servants to ourselves, since these good works secure *for us* the rewards God has been pleased to promise.

Q. Could God order us to perform good works without promising us any recompense?

A. Certainly; because we are *his creatures*, and the grace which enables us is *his*. The Council of Trent, Sess. xvi. chap. 16, says: "God's goodness to man is so great, that he even desires his own gifts to be converted into our merit."

Q. Have we reason to trust much in our good works?

A. "God forbid," says the same Council, "that any Christian should glory, or confide in himself, and not in the Lord."

Q. How is it, then, that Protestants reproach Catholics with placing too much confidence in their good works?

A. They reproach us, because they do not know us; and the only return we should make for their ill-treatment of us, is to pray, as Christ did for the ignorant Jews, who put him to death: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

CHAP. IV.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What is sanctification?

A. Making holy. Thus God for Christ's sake by the Holy Ghost *sanctifies* his people, making them to love and serve him in good works.

Q. To whom, and to *whom alone*, is all the merit and praise of these good works due?

A. To God himself. He *commences* it by a new birth of our souls, (which were first born entirely unholy,) "creating" us entirely anew "in Christ Jesus unto good works."* Then he *continues* us in them through our lives, (Heb. 13: 21, and Phil. 2: 13, etc.,) "that," as St. Paul says, "no flesh should glory in his presence."†

Q. The Doctrinal Catechism asks, "Have we reason to trust MUCH in our good works?" I will ask, Have we reason to trust in them AT ALL?

* Eph. 2: 10: "Created in Christ Jesus in good works."—Douay Bible.

† 1 Cor. 1: 29: "That no flesh should glory in his sight."—Douay Bible.

A. "God forbid," says St. Paul, (a higher authority than the Council of Trent,) "that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ."*

Q. Have we reason to fear that at least a great part of the members of the Roman Church do not in fact build their hope of salvation upon this only true foundation of the sole merits of our Lord?

A. Yes; not only because they use so many superstitions, but also because their pastors seem so anxious to prove that we can *in some way* bring God in our debt by our good works. The whole spirit of the Gospel is against this. That teaches us, with joyful humility, to forget our praise in the glory of God; (as above,) "that no flesh should glory in his presence," and, "Whether, therefore, ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God."†

Q. What plain betrayal of a *different spirit* is there in the Doctrinal Catechism?

A. Its attempt to explain away those simple words of our Lord: "Say, We are unprofitable servants." "*We are not unprofitable servants* TO OURSELVES"! Then we are serving ourselves. But what we do *can* be "good works" only as we do it to serve God. "Do ALL to the glory of God."

CHAP. V.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Can a man satisfy for his own sins?

A. No; neither man nor angel, nor both men and angels, can ever satisfy for one mortal sin. Jesus Christ alone could and has satisfied for our sins.

Q. Can we apply to ourselves the satisfaction of Jesus?

A. We can, certainly, with the help of God's grace.

Q. How is the satisfaction of Christ applied to us?

A. In two ways, either when we receive a full remission of temporal as well as eternal punishment, or

* Gal. 6: 14. So the Douay Bible.

† 1 Cor. 10: 31: "Therefore, whether you eat or drink, or whatsoever else you do, do all to the glory of God."—Douay Bible.

when the eternal is remitted and some temporal punishment is reserved for us to endure.

Q. In what case are both the eternal and temporal punishment remitted by the application of the satisfaction of Christ to our souls?

A. In baptism, by which all sin, and all punishment due to sin is remitted.

Q. When are the satisfactions of Jesus so applied to our souls, that, though the eternal punishment be remitted, we may have some temporal punishment to endure?

A. Commonly in the sacrament of penance.

Q. Are not the guilt and the punishment remitted together?

A. No; for it often happens that God, in forgiving the sinner, changes the eternal punishment which he has deserved by his sins, into a temporal or temporary punishment.

Q. Make this clear by an example from 2 Kings, 12th chap.

A. David is guilty of murder, which deserves the eternal punishment of hell. Nathan warns him of his danger. David repents—"I have," says he, "sinned against the Lord." Nathan replies: "*The Lord also hath taken away thy sin; THOU SHALT NOT DIE.*" Behold the eternal punishment taken away; but what is substituted in its place? Mark what follows, a temporal punishment is substituted in its place: "Nevertheless, because thou hast given occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme; *for this thing, THE CHILD THAT IS BORN TO THEE SHALL SURELY DIE.*" (Prot. Vers. 2 Sam. 12.)

Q. Give another Scriptural example that all doubt may be removed.

A. In the 24th chap. of same Book, (Protest. Vers. 2 Sam. chap. 24,) David repents of his sinful pride in numbering the people: God forgives him, but on condition, that he should suffer, as a *temporal punishment*, either *seven years of famine*, or *three months of flight before his enemies*, or *three days of pestilence*; and, in addition, the prophet Gad orders him to erect an altar and offer sacrifice to the Lord.

Q. Can the penitent sinner pay, in any manner, the debt of TEMPORAL punishment which is due to the justice of God?

A. Yes; as is quite evident from the above two pas-

sages. Indeed, the Scripture counsels it in express terms. Daniel 4 : 24 : "Wherefore, O king, let my counsel be acceptable to thee; redeem thou thy sins with alms, and thy iniquities with works of mercy to the poor." The same may be drawn from Protestant Vers. chap. 4 : 27, though much corrupted to suit a Protestant purpose. Our Saviour himself, Luke 11 : 4, says : "GIVE ALMS, and BEHOLD ALL THINGS ARE CLEAN UNTO YOU."

CHAP. V.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Is it said any where in the word of God that "Baptism remits both the eternal and temporal punishment of sin" ?

A. No where whatever.

Q. Is ANY THING said in that perfect Book, of a distinction between "the eternal punishment of sin," and a "temporal punishment" of the same ?

A. Nothing whatever.

Q. What about "the sacrament of penance" ?

A. There is nothing about that either, in the Scriptures. It is a superstitious invention of men, (as we shall prove in its place,) long after the Apostles, like the ideas of "Purgatory" and "the Mass."

Q. What of the passages which the Doctrinal Catechism professes to cite from the Holy Scriptures as instances in which God in forgiving the sinner, *changed* the eternal punishment which he had deserved by his sin into a temporal or temporary punishment ?

A. There is nothing said of any *changing* or *exchanging* of punishments whatever in either of these cases. God forgives David. Yet he visits him with severe trouble, for an example to others, and a salutary chastisement to him, as it is written : "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth."* It is a low and unworthy thought to call this *commuting eternal death* for the smaller punishment. I do not see from this case of David that I am bound to go to a priest and submit to such "penances" as he may choose to impose upon me.

* Heb. 12 : 6 : "Whom the Lord loveth he chastiseth."—Douay Bible.

Q. What of "the penitent sinners paying this supposed debt of temporal punishment"?

A. The Doctrinal Catechism claims to prove this first by quoting from the 4th chap. of Daniel. It is the Roman Church which gives a false translation of this passage. Here is the true one: "Wherefore, O king, let my counsel be acceptable unto thee, and *break off* thy sins *by righteousness*, and thine iniquities by *showing mercy to the poor*." This was said by the prophet Daniel to that wicked tyrant Nebuchadnezzar, calling upon him to cease his oppressions. According to the Roman Church a tyrant may continue these if he will only give a little money to "redeem his sins with alms."* As for the words, "Give alms and behold all things are clean unto you," this was said to the Pharisees to rebuke them for being so nice about clean *dishes*, and caring nothing for foul and covetous hearts. Does the Roman Church really tell us that, *if one only gives money this makes him clean from all sin*? If this is true we ought to alter the words of our Lord and say, "How *easily*" (not "how *hardly*") "shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!"† There is reason to fear that, as we have before noticed, that Church does in fact by these and like teachings, not seldom lead men off from the only true dependence for salvation. If not, we shall be most happy to find so at the day when all things shall be made known.

And now, let me ask you, my reader, whoever you may be, to pause and consider whether *you* have that true saving *faith* in Christ Jesus our Lord. Reflect that this is no mere matter of opinion—that THIS is the very "soul of religion."

* Just as the Pope calls the wretch who now governs Naples, his "*dear son*," etc.

† Mark 10 : 23. So the Douay Bible.

On Indulgences.

CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

an Indulgence?

A. It is a remission of the temporal punishment due to venial sin, and also to mortal sin, after the eternal punishment has been remitted, as mentioned above in the case of David.

Q. Are sins remitted by Indulgences?

A. No; sins are remitted by the sacraments of baptism and penance.

Q. Has the Church the power to remit temporal punishments?

A. When the applicant or sinner is properly disposed, the Church has power to remove every obstacle to his admission into heaven: but a debt of temporal punishment, due to God's justice, is a temporary obstacle; therefore the Church has power to remove it. That this proposition is most certainly true, is evident from Matt. 18 : 18 : "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven." From which it is more than evident, that the powers of the Church, over sin and its punishment, are not in any way confined or restrained, provided always, that the sinner have the proper dispositions; and if the Church has power to remit the sin itself, (as beyond all doubt she has,) she has surely power to remit the *temporal punishment* due to sin.

Q. Are Indulgences of very ancient date in the Church?

A. Yes; since the very commencement of Christianity.

Q. Give us a clear instance of their early use?

A. St. Paul granted an indulgence to the incestuous Corinthian, by the remission of the temporal punishment to which he had subjected that public sinner; and the Apostle declares, that it is by the power of Christ, and in Christ's person he acts in this matter. 2 Cor.

2 : 10 : “For *what I have pardoned*, if I have pardoned any thing, for your sakes have I done it *in the person of Christ.*”

Q. Is this temporal punishment always inflicted in this life?

A. It may be inflicted here, or in Purgatory hereafter; and if not discharged here, it must be discharged hereafter.

Q. Do the Fathers of the early Church speak of Indulgences or the remission of temporal punishment?

A. Yes; St. Cyprian, Epist. 18th, says, that the bishops of the Church granted (like St. Paul) a remission of the canonical penances and penitential works, by the mediation of holy confessors or martyrs, “the abundance of whose merits might supply for the want of their brethren,” according to that of St. Paul: “I now rejoice *in suffering for you.*” (Col. 1 : 24.)

Q. Have any Councils spoken on this subject?

A. The Council of Ancyra (anno 314) orders the bishops, “having considered the conduct of the penitents, to *show them mercy, or to lengthen the time of their penance.*”

Q. What inference do you draw from this practice of the Church in ancient times?

A. That, in the remission of the canonical penances, she also remitted so much of the temporal punishment before God.

Q. Why? what connection is there between the one and the other?

A. The canonical penances were inflicted by God’s Church as a temporal punishment due to sin. This as inflicted by his Church, is accepted by God, either as the whole or a part of what his justice demands; for whatever his *true Church* does, is done by *himself*—“As my Father sent *me*, even so I send *you*,” “Whatsoever you shall loose in earth, shall be loosed also in heaven;” “He that heareth you, heareth me;” etc., etc.

Q. Can any Indulgence or leave be granted by any power on earth to commit sin?

A. No; nor can God himself give leave to commit what is, of its own nature, sinful.

Q. Does not the Pope give leave to tell lies, and commit perjury, and make mental reservations, and be disloyal, and persecute Protestants, when these appear to him to promote the Catholic cause?

A. No; these are all Protestant calumnies.

Q. Would dispensations or pardons granted for any such ends have any validity?

A. No; they would only add sacrilege to blasphemy.

Q. Is it an article of the Catholic faith, that temporal punishment is remitted before God by an Indulgence?

A. It is not so defined in express terms; but by what *is* defined on the subject, and by necessary consequence from other doctrines, bearing on this, it is, and always has been held by Catholics as substantially of faith, although not formally so defined.

Q. What has the Church decided on this subject?

A. That God has left in his Church the power of granting Indulgences, and that Indulgences are extremely advantageous to the Christian people. Decret. 1, de Indul. Sess. 25.

Q. Is there any thing in this decree with which Protestants can *reasonably* be offended?

A. No; for they themselves grant Indulgences of their own, as is evident from the history of the *cutty stool*. For particular sins, those who were rich were mulcted in a pecuniary fine, and those who were poor were obliged to give *satisfaction* before the whole congregation. Now, either this was of use to the sinner or it was not; if the former, it was an Indulgence; if the latter, then for what purpose was it practised? For further proof of the practice of the ancient and pure Church, see Coun. of Nice, (anno 325,) Can. xii. Conc. Gen. t. 2.

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What does the Roman Church mean by "Indulgences"?

A. It is not easy to say, as *since the Reformation* its teachers have been very cautious, and somewhat contradictory about this. We can, however, quote again from a "Bull" of Pope Leo XII., in 1825, as follows:

"We have resolved in virtue of the authority given to us by heaven, fully to unlock that sacred treasure composed of the merits, sufferings, and virtues of Christ our Lord, and of HIS VIRGIN MOTHER, AND ALL THE SAINTS," etc. "We mercifully give and grant in the Lord a plenary indulgence, REMISSION, AND PARDON OF ALL THEIR SINS," etc.* Then addressing the bishops, etc.: "To you it belongs to explain with perspicuity the power of indulgences, what is their efficacy, *not only* in the remission of canonical penances, but also THE TEMPORAL PUNISHMENT DUE TO DIVINE JUSTICE FOR SIN; and what succor is afforded out of this heavenly treasure from the merits of Christ AND HIS SAINTS to such as *have departed* real penitents in God's love, yet *before they had duly satisfied* by fruits worthy of penance for sins of commission and omission, and are now PURIFYING IN THE FIRES OF PURGATORY; that an entrance may be opened for them into their eternal country, where nothing defiled is admitted."†

Q. Why is all this plainly false and superstitious?

A. Because it joins the "merits" of some of our fellow-creatures with those of our Lord Christ, to save men; because it makes a false distinction between a "temporal" and the eternal punishment of sin; and because there is no such place as "Purgatory" at all.

Q. How are these "Indulgences" to be obtained by those who wish them?

A. It has always been the well-known custom of the Roman Church, to sell them. *Fleury* says that the plenary indulgence was first used by Pope Urban II., to encourage the Crusade, at the close of the XIth century, and that: "The Indulgence *took the place of* WAGES to the Crusaders."‡ In the XVth century, (not long before the Reformation,) the ordinary price was *five ducats a piece*, (about twenty dollars of our present

* What can be said of the impudence of any follower of the Pope, who sets forth his doctrine as follows, "*Are sins remitted by Indulgences? No?*" (See page 186.)

† Bull, Rom. xvi. 55.

‡ xviii. 4, 6th Dis. Prel. The reader will remember, that this writer lived and died a priest of the Roman Church, and in great influence and honor with the King of France.

money.) This interfered so much with the fees of the parish priests for confessions, that they (while denouncing the reckless wickedness of this getting pardons with money) had it decreed in the Provincial Council of Constance (1476) that *one fourth of the price of indulgences should be always paid to them.** It was (as we have seen before) the plenary Indulgence published by Pope Leo X., to obtain money to complete the Church of St. Peter, at Rome, which first aroused the indignation of Luther, and began the great Reformation. Father Paul (a famous priest of the Roman Church) says that those who sold the "Indulgences" "spent in taverns and elsewhere, in gambling, and other things of which it is best to say nothing, *what the people took from their necessities to buy INDULGENCES.*"†

Q. Did St. Paul ever issue such *indulgences* as these?

A. There is no such thing as "indulgences" spoken of in the Holy Scripture. Read *this whole passage* of St. Paul, (2 Cor. 2 : 5-10,) and judge for yourself. He had before enjoined upon the Church in Corinth, to expel a man from the communion for a gross sin. He now *advises them* to restore him, as he had heartily repented, and says: "To whom *ye forgive* any thing, I forgive also; for if I forgave any thing, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes forgave I it in the person of Christ."‡ Does that sound like the Bull of Pope Leo XII.?

Q. What *was* done in the early Church under the authority to "bind and loose"?

A. Just such *discipline* as this of St. Paul. Bad members of the Church were either suspended or expelled from its communion, or otherwise publicly punished, to humble them, and to warn others. If, however, they repented they were restored. Afterward this began to be mixed by degrees with some superstitions. But *nothing like* the shocking "indulgences" of the

* Hartz. Conc. Germ. v. 546, as quoted by Mosheim.

† Hist. Conc. Trent i. 16.

‡ 2 Cor. 2 : 10: "And to whom you have pardoned any thing, I also. For what I have pardoned, if I have pardoned any thing, for your sakes have I done it in the person of Christ."—Douay Bible.

Dark Ages was known until long after. The Greek, and other Eastern Churches have *never* believed in these "indulgences." (Yet the Doctrinal Catechism says that *Luther first invented* the Protestant doctrine about this!)*

Q. The Doctrinal Catechism says, (page 183,) that, "The guilt and the punishment of sin are not remitted together;" is this what the first Christians believed?

A. No, as is plain from all the Fathers. For instance, Tertullian: "*When the guilt is removed, the punishment is so likewise.*"† (St.) Chrysostom: "Where there is grace there is remission, *where there is remission there is no punishment.*"‡

Q. Does the Roman Church ever grant "indulgences" directly to commit sins, such as falsehood, and the like?

A. Whether it does or not in so many words, some who purchase "indulgences" will be sure to think so; and *it is a positive fact* that men have so understood them in past times.§

Q. What do you say of what the Doctrinal Catechism tells us "the Church has decided on this subject"?

A. That it is very *convenient*. It *leaves room* for all these abuses, and yet does not expose that Church to

* *Card. Cajetan* (a very great authority in the Roman Church) says: "If there could be certainty arrived at about the commencement of Indulgences, it would avail us much in finding the truth. But there is *no authority of Scripture, or ancient Fathers*, either Greek or Latin, that gives us any knowledge of them.

† De Bapt. iv. 163. Semler.

‡ Hom. viii. in Ep. ad Rom. s. 4.

§ This is the language of the Indulgences sold in Luther's time: "I, —, absolve thee, —, from all excesses, sins, and crimes that thou mayst have committed. I efface all stains of weakness, and all traces of shame that thou mayst have drawn upon thyself by such actions. —, I hereby reincorporate thee in the communion of the saints, and restore thee to the innocence and purity of thy Baptism, so that, at the moment of death, the gate of the place of torment shall be shut against thee, and the gate of the Paradise of joy shall be opened unto thee; and if thou shouldst live long, this grace continueth unchangeable till the time of thy end." Tetzel, also in selling them, used to say: "Draw near and I will give you letters duly sealed by which even the sins you shall hereafter desire to commit shall be all forgiven you." Sleidan ii. 22.

That this Church has directly allowed perjury and murder we will have shocking proofs in the chapter on "Persecution" and the "Inquisition," (see pp. .)

the disgrace of them: We must, therefore, judge the "indulgences," not by these words, but by their *actual working and effects*.

Q. *Has the Protestant Church any such indulgences?*

A. NOTHING OF THE KIND WHATEVER.



On the Head of the Church.

CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Who is the true and chief head of the Church?

A. Jesus Christ is the true head of the Church, who, being himself invisible, governs his Church from heaven in an invisible manner.

Q. Did Jesus Christ appoint any vicar on earth to govern his Church in quality of visible chief or head?

A. Yes; he appointed for that purpose St. Peter and his successors.

Q. Did St. Peter receive more power than the other Apostles from Christ?

A. Yes; as is evident from many passages of Scripture.

Q. Quote St. Matthew, chap. 16.

A. "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Q. What is meant here by the word "rock"?

A. Peter himself.

Q. Why?

A. Because in John 1 : 42, Christ, in calling Peter, gives him a new name, which signifies a rock, and which explains clearly the meaning of the word "rock" in the above text. "Thou art Simon the son of Jona, thou shalt be called *Cephas*, which is interpreted Peter, or a rock." Our Saviour spoke in the Syriac language, and in that language, *Cephas* is the same as *Petros* in the Greek, both meaning a rock; indeed, the words of

Christ, literally interpreted, have this meaning : "*Thou art a rock, and upon this rock I will build my Church.*" Such words were not addressed to any other Apostle.

Q. What are the words of the text immediately following? Matt. 16 : 19.

A. "And I will give to thee (Peter) the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shall loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."

Q. Did not Christ address the same words to all the Apostles?

A. On this occasion, he addressed these words to *Peter alone*, which makes it quite evident that he intended to confer on Peter a peculiar power; when he addressed the other Apostles in these words, he did so *generally*, and to all *in common*.

Q. What does Christ say to Peter—John 21 : 15, 16, 17?

A. "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep." And the Fathers of the Church have understood by the lambs, the lay faithful people; and by the sheep, the pastors of the people; for, as the sheep nourish the lambs, so do the pastors of the Church tend, and spiritually feed, their flocks.

Q. What do you conclude from the above commission given *only* to *Peter*?

A. That Christ gave the charge of the whole Church, pastors and people, sheep and lambs, to Peter alone.

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Who is the Head and Monarch of the Universal Church?

A. Our Lord Jesus Christ, reigning in heaven.

Q. Has he any one member of the Church to represent him in this world, and rule over it in his name?

A. No. He says to his Apostles, and through them to all his people: "*One* is your Master, *even Christ*, and ye are all brethren."*

* Matt. 23 : 8: "For one is your Master, and you are all brethren."
—Douay Bible. The phrase, "even Christ," whether rightly omitted

Q. Whence, then, came the doctrine of the Roman Church, that the Bishop of Rome is "the Vicar of Christ," to reign in his place, under the title of Pope, over all Christians in this world?

A. It arose by degrees, as we have seen of some other false doctrines. Nothing like it is found among the first Christians. Near the close of the second century, and beginning of the third, respect to Rome as the chief city of the world, gave rise to some expressions in Christian writings, which sound a little like it. From this the notion grew, until at last it produced the Papal power of the Dark Ages.

Q. What shall we say to those who claim that St. Peter was the first Pope?

A. This Apostle wrote two Epistles to the Universal Church. *In these he does not make the least claim to any such authority, or allude to it:* he speaks just as the other Apostles do in their Epistles. It is not possible to suppose that *he*, if he had believed himself to be the "sole Vicar of Christ upon earth," would not have shown some mark of it in these letters. Compare them with any of the Bulls of the Popes: for instance, that of Pius IV., deposing Queen Elizabeth: "He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and on earth, committed One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, out of which there is no salvation, to one alone upon earth, to Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and to Peter's successor, the Bishop of Rome, to be governed in fullness of power. HIM ALONE HE MADE PRINCE OVER ALL PEOPLE AND ALL KINGDOMS, TO PLUCK UP, DESTROY, SCATTER, PLANT, AND BUILD," etc. *It is not possible* to escape from this conclusion, that St. Peter never *supposed himself* to be a Pope.

Q. What, then, shall we say of the words of our Lord to him, "And I will give unto thee the keys," etc.?

A. It is plain that this must have been said to him only as *one of* the Apostles, the Lord appointing all those blessed men to be chief Pastors of the Church. What puts this beyond doubt is, that when *after his*

or not, is certainly meant, as is plain from the second verse after, where the same idea is thus repeated: "One is your Master, *even Christ*."—Douay Bible.

Resurrection, (this was before,) he did formally establish the Church, he says the same thing in substance to all the Apostles. (See John 20 : 23.)

Q. Does it disagree with this, that he had said just before to St. Peter, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock," etc.?

A. The Roman Church argues from this, that *Peter is the rock* on which the Church is built. Now, the word *Peter* (*petrus* in the original) does not mean a *rock*, but a *stone*, a fragment of rock; (rock is *petra*.) Simon had been named Peter (a stone) long before, (John 1 : 42,) from the natural firmness of his character, as is supposed. At this time Christ had asked the Apostles, "Who say ye that I am?" and Peter answered eagerly for them all: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Then the Lord said: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say also unto thee that thou art Peter, (Petrus,) and upon this rock (petra) I will build my Church."*

What *rock*, then, did he mean? Plainly, "*This faith on the Son of God—this Saviour in whom you believe.*" This agrees with all the rest of Scripture, in which God or Christ is frequently called "the Rock," or a *foundation-stone*, but *Peter* NEVER.† That this is the true and natural meaning, appears also from this, that even three hundred years after the Apostles, when the Church was plainly tending toward this Roman monarchy, (as was not strange in those days of *political despotism*.) (St.) Augustine says: "Moreover, the Lord says, 'Upon this rock I will build my Church,' because Peter had said, 'Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.' 'Upon this Rock, therefore, *which thou hast confessed*,

* Matt. 16 : 15, etc. : "But whom do you say that I am? Thou art Christ the Son of the living God. Blessed art thou," etc., (as above.) "And I say unto thee that thou art Peter," etc., (as above.)—Douay Bible.

† ST. PETER HIMSELF uses this term in this way: "Wherefore also it is contained in the Scripture, Behold I lay in Zion a *chief corner-stone*, elect, precious," etc. "Unto you, therefore, which believe, *He* is precious, but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence."—1 Peter 2 : 6-8.

I will build my Church.' For THE ROCK WAS CHRIST, upon which foundation Peter himself was also built."*

Q. What of the meaning which the Doctrinal Catechism says "the Fathers of the Church" have given to the words, "Feed my sheep, feed my lambs"?

A. This silly meaning is falsely fathered upon them. The same Augustine thus gives the natural meaning: "*Feed my sheep. I commit my sheep to thee. What sheep? Those which I have bought with my blood. I have died for them. Dost thou love me? Die, then, for them,*" etc. That which was committed to Peter, that which he was commanded to do, *not Peter only, but likewise all the Apostles heard, held, and kept. We feed, therefore,*" etc.†

CHAP. II.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Have you any other proofs of St. Peter's Primacy or supremacy?

A. Yes; in Luke 22 : 26, Christ says to his Apostles: "He that is greater among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is the leader, as he that serveth." Therefore there was a GREATER, or LEADER, amongst the Apostles, otherwise Christ's words could have no meaning; but if there was a leader, Peter, and no other, was that man.

Q. Does Christ any where offer up a special prayer for Peter's faith, without including, in this prayer, the rest of the Apostles?

A. Yes; Luke 22 : 32: Christ says to Peter these words: "But I have prayed for thee, that thy FAITH FAIL NOT; and thou, being once converted, CONFIRM THY BRETHREN." From which it is clear, that Peter had a superiority over his brethren given him by Christ; for if he was only their equal, how could he *confirm* them?

Q. Why does Christ John, chap. 21 : 15, before giving Peter the

* Tract. 24, on John xxi. Op. See also to the same effect, Op. vii. 1349, and v. 764.

† Serm. 296, Op. vii. 1354.

special charge of all Christ's lambs and sheep, ask that Apostle whether he loves him (Christ) MORE than the other Apostles love him?

A. Christ evidently requires greater love from Peter, because he is to confer a greater dignity upon him, committing to his care the whole Christian community, pastors and people.

Q. Have you any other Scriptural proof of Peter's superiority?

A. When the Scripture gives the names of the Apostles in order, Peter's name is always placed first. (Matt. chap. 10.) Nor can it be alleged that this was done because Peter was the oldest, for Andrew was Peter's elder, and was even the first to follow Christ. St. Ambrose, in Epist. ii. ad Cor. cap. xii. says: "Not Andrew, but Peter was chief amongst the Apostles." St. Augus. lib. de Baptis., says: "Behold Peter, who held the preëminence with such lustre." St. Optat., lib. contra Parmen., adds: "Peter was appointed chief of the Apostles, to the end that unity might be preserved in the Church."

Q. Did Peter act at any time as chief functionary of the Church?

A. He did so immediately after the Ascension of our Lord. He assembled the Apostles; he presided at the election of an Apostle to replace Judas. (Acts, chap. 1.) Peter was the first to preach Jesus Christ crucified, and, by the conversion of three thousand at his first sermon, first gave form to the Christian Church, verifying the words of Christ, that he should be the rock or foundation from which the Church should rise. (Acts, chap. 2.) He is first to teach the admission of the Pagans or heathens to baptism, which matter he alone was taught by a revelation from heaven. (Acts, chap. 10.) He works the first miracles, at the Beautiful gate of the Temple, on the lame man, (Acts, chap. 3,) on Æneas and Tabitha, (Acts, chap. 9,) and as a punishment on Ananias and Sapphira, (Acts, chap. 5.)

Q. Does it appear, from any other circumstances, that Peter was chief amongst the Apostles?

A. Yes; for when he was cast into prison the *whole* Church prayed for him, nor was this done for any of the other Apostles; to him alone did heaven vouchsafe an angel as a deliverer from his prison, (Acts, chap. 12.)

Q. Did Peter act as presiding teacher amongst the Apostles?

A. Yes; he decided, in the first Council held at Jerusalem by the Apostles, that the Christians should not be subjected to the Jewish rite of circumcision; St. Paul, though an Apostle, did not venture to decide upon it. "Men, brethren," said Peter, "you know that in former days *God made CHOICE among us*, that by *my mouth* the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel;" and, when Peter had made an end of speaking, "*all the multitude held their peace*;" and even James himself, who was bishop of Jerusalem, where the Apostles were assembled, rose only to repeat St. Peter's decision, and to acquiesce in it, (Acts 15.)

Q. What do you conclude from all this?

A. That there is not one truth more clearly established in Scripture, than the superiority or supremacy of Peter, and that the acrimonious attacks of Protestants on this article of the Christian faith, only prove that they make a sport of the Scripture, except in as far as it supplies them with some passages, seeming to bear two meanings, which they pervert, in order to prop up the tottering fabrics of contradictory and contrary schisms.

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What of the passage, "He that is greater among you," etc.?

A. It evidently *forbids* the idea of Peter's being superior to the others, as is plain from *the whole passage*. Here it is: "And there was also a strife amongst them which of them should be accounted the greatest. And he said unto them, The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. *But ye shall not be so*;"* but he that is greatest among you let him be as the younger, and he that is chief as he that doth

* The Church was not to imitate the great political monarchies and aristocracies, but to be a simple and modest republic.

serve.”* This forbids any one of them to think himself the greatest or to *aspire* to be so. Remember that this was said *after* the words, “Thou art Peter,” etc. If then the Lord *had* already in the presence of the others, appointed *Peter* the chief of the Apostles, could there have been a “strife among them which should be the greatest”? Or if so, would he not have put an end to it at once (and confounded all Protestants too) by saying, “PETER IS THE GREATEST”?

Q. What of Christ's special prayer for Peter?

A. This was plainly on account of that shameful treason of his at the High Priest's palace, which the Lord foresaw: a strange proof of his being that Lord's vicergerent! And could not Christ then tell him, “When thou art converted strengthen (that is, confirm, encourage) thy brethren;” without having appointed him chief over them?

Q. Does it appear that the Lord had made him chief because he afterward asked him, “Lovest thou me more than these”?

A. He evidently used these words as a tender rebuke of Peter's rash self-confidence and shameful fall, and as a warning for the future. That disciple had said before “Though all men shall be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended.”† Yet *he was* the very one who openly and profanely denied him. After all this, the Lord might well ask him three times to think whether he was sure that he excelled his brother Apostles in love for him. Peter was now very penitent and humble. So he modestly replies: “Lord, thou knowest that I love thee.”‡

Q. What do the other things cited from Scripture by the Doctrinal Catechism prove?

A. Simply that St. Peter was *one of* the leading

* Luke 22 : 24-26: “And there was also a strife amongst them, which of them should seem to be greater. And he said unto them, The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them and they that have power over them are called beneficent. But you not so: but he that is the greater among you let him become as the younger, and he that is the leader as he that serveth.”—Douay Bible.

† Matt. 26 : 33: “Although all shall be scandalized in thee, I will never be scandalized.”—Douay Bible.

‡ John 21 : 15, etc. So the Douay Bible.

Apostles. A number of such things could be collected about either one of three others, Sts. James, John, and Paul. It is *not* said, however, that "he assembled the Apostles and presided at the election," etc.

Q. What *decisive passage* is there in Holy Scripture showing that St. Peter was just this and nothing more?

A. St. Paul, speaking of a visit which he made to Jerusalem, says: "And when JAMES, CEPHAS, (PETER,) AND JOHN, WHO SEEMED TO BE PILLARS," etc.* Here St. Peter is not only not called chief of the Apostles, but not even named first of those three! St. Paul goes on to say that afterward, "when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face because he was to be blamed."† Is that what bishops of the Roman Church ever do to the Pope now?

Q. Did St. Peter preside in the Council at Jerusalem and "decide," as stated in the Doctrinal Catechism?

A. *Plainly not.* Holy Scripture (Acts 15) gives us to understand that *St. James* presided in this Council, and announced its decision. St. Peter only spoke in the debate and expressed his opinion. We may judge of the general fairness of the Doctrinal Catechism by one instance here. It says that "when St. Peter had made an end of speaking, '*all the multitude held their peace.*'" The Scripture says: "Then all the multitude kept silence AND GAVE AUDIENCE UNTO BARNABAS AND SAUL," (Paul.)‡

CHAP. III.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. The supremacy of St. Peter once established, what necessarily follows?

A. That all the *successors* of St. Peter hold the same *rank* and *power*; because the form of government, established by Christ in his Church, was not to last merely

* Gal. 2:9. So the Douay Bible.

† Gal. 2:11: "But when Cephas was come to Antioch, I withstood him," etc.—Douay Bible.

‡ Acts 15:12: "And all the multitude held their peace: and they heard Barnabas and Paul telling," etc.—Douay Bible.

during one or two centuries, but always, like the Church, *until the consummation of the world.*

Q. Who are the successors of St. Peter?

A. The bishops of Rome, in which capital of the world, St. Peter established his See and ended his life.

Q. What reply do you make to those who pretend to hold that St. Peter never was at Rome?

A. We put the following rather troublesome questions to them. In the first place, tell us, if St. Peter did not suffer martyrdom at Rome under the Emperor Nero, in what part of the world, and when did he die? Secondly, if St. Peter did not die at Rome, at what time, and from what country, were his relics or remains transported thither, for there they are beyond all doubt? Thirdly, did not the Fathers of the early and pure Church, who lived near to the time of St. Peter, know better than Protestants, who made their first appearance only three hundred years ago, who was the first bishop of Rome?

Q. Do any of these Fathers say St. Peter was the first?

A. Yes; St. Augustine, Ep. ad Gener., enumerating the bishops who had governed the Church of Rome, begins thus: Peter was the first, to Peter succeeded Linus, and to Linus, Clement. St. Optatus, contra Parmen.: "St. Peter *first* occupied the See of Rome, to him Linus succeeded, and after Linus, Clement." St. Ireneus, lib. iii. cap. 3; St. Epiphanius, de 27 Heres.; and all the other Fathers who have given a catalogue of the bishops of Rome, assign the first occupation of that See to Peter. St. Leo, in Ser. de Petro et Paulo, says: "Rome became the capital of the Christian world, because St. Peter established his See in Rome." In Pream. Concil. Chalce., and also in Coun. Ephes., it is said, that "Peter lives, judges, and defines, in his *successors.*" "Happy Church," says Tertullian, addressing the Church of Rome, "which the *Great Apostles* fully impregnated with all their doctrine and all their *blood.*"

CHAP. III.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. If it could be proved that St. Peter was the chief of the Apostles, would it follow that the Bishops of Rome succeed him in that authority?

A. *By no means.* It is not even *probable* that he ever was Bishop of Rome; nor is there *any reason to think* that, if he had been, all his authority would have descended to the other bishops of Rome after him.

Q. What do we know of his ever being at Rome at all?

A. The Holy Scripture (which recounts St. Paul's labors in that city) says nothing of it. The most we can think is that *probably* he preached there with St. Paul. But these two Apostles seem to have made *Linus* the first bishop of that Church. So says Irenæus,* a hundred years after, the oldest authority we have.

Q. How does it farther appear impossible that the bishops of Rome could at first have had such authority in the Church as they now claim?

A. Because, even if St. Peter had been "the Prince of the Apostles," *one of the other great Apostles* would have taken this chief place after him. Whereas, according to that claim, after the death of St. Peter, *the great and holy* St. JOHN was for more than thirty years under *Linus and others*, bishops of Rome!

Now, to clear up all this difficulty, let a single sentence of the word of God be produced which says: "The Bishops of Rome shall always have supreme rule in the Church, by the title of Pope"—or *any thing like it!* YES, LET THEM PRODUCE IT!

CHAP. IV.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Do all the faithful owe obedience to the bishop of Rome?

A. Yes; all are bound to obey him as the vicar of Jesus Christ, the chief bishop of the whole Christian Church.

* Contra Hær. iii. 3.

Q. Is it a grievous sin to refuse submission to the sovereign Pontiff?

A. "Whoever oppose," says St. Paul, "the lawful authorities, oppose the order of the Almighty, and those who resist such authorities, bring condemnation on themselves."

Q. Is it necessary that all Christian Churches be in strict communion with the See of Rome?

A. So all the Fathers teach. St. Irenæus, lib. iii. cap. 3, says, "The Roman Church is the principal, and hence all other Churches must be united to her." St. Cyprian, lib. i. Epist. 8: "There is only one God, one Christ, one Church, *one chair of Peter*, established by the word of Christ himself." St. Jerom, Epist. to Pope Damasus: "I am attached to your chair, which is that of St. Peter; I know that the Church is built upon that rock;" and again: "Whoever eats not the Lamb in that house, is profane; whoever takes not refuge in that ark, shall perish in the waters of the deluge; whoever is not with *you* is against *Jesus Christ*; whoever gathereth not with you, scattereth abroad."

Q. Why is the Catholic Church called also Roman?

A. Because the Catholic Churches of all nations and ages have honored the See of Rome, and on account of its "superior headship," have always gloried in the profession of their attachment to it.

CHAP. IV.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. It is plain then that no such thing as the power of the Popes existed in the days of the Apostles. How was it afterward established?

A. We see the first faint trace of it about one hundred years after them, in a general deference in Western Europe and the regions around, (but not in the East,) to the opinions of the Bishops of Rome. This was chiefly produced by that city's being the political capital of that part of the world, which was then, let us remember, governed despotically by Emperors who lived at Rome. Thus (St.) Cyprian says: "Plainly on

account of its magnitude Rome ought to precede Carthage.* Yet the same Cyprian writes to the Bishop of Rome as his "fellow bishop," (not the "Holy Father,") and disputes with him about baptism, condemning his opinions, and saying that, "every bishop exercises the free choice of his own will in the administration of the Church, having to render an account of his acts *to the Lord*."† Eusebius wrote the first Church history (two hundred years) after the Apostles; and *he says not a word about Popes or their authority*. A hundred years later (St.) Jerome, (though he does at one time speak strongly of the authority of the "chair of Peter," for the false doctrine had begun to unfold itself,) says: "*Wherever there is a bishop, whether at Rome or Eugubium, (a small town near Rome,) or Constantinople or Rhegium, or Alexandria or Tanis; he is of the same excellency, of the same episcopate*."‡ The Roman bishops were usually very ambitious men, and labored to extend the power which their positions gave them; and about this time *the Emperor* decreed that they might try appeals from other bishops. Not long after one of them attempted to palm upon a Council of African bishops (among whom was (St.) Augustine) a false decree of the Council of Nice, recommending final appeals to Rome in all disputed cases; but the fraud was detected and exposed.§ A "General Council" (I. of Constantinople) had already decreed (in 381) that "the Bishop of Constantinople ought to have a primacy of honor after the Bishop of Rome, *because Constantinople is the New Rome*,"|| that is, the *other capital* of the Empire. Nothing could show more plainly that it was the *political importance* of Rome which had given its bishops such an influence; and also

* Ep. ad Corn. 49, p. 342.

† Ep. ad Steph. 72, p. 411. (In this correspondence the Bp. of Rome addresses Cyprian as *Pope*, (that is, *father*,) a title then common to all bishops.

‡ Op. ii. 221.

§ Labb. iii. 532. Letter of Af. Bishops to Celestine.

|| That city had now become one of the residences of the Roman Emperors. This same Council calls the Church of *Jerusalem* (not of Rome) "the mother of all the churches."—Theod. Hist. Ecc. v. 9. Op. iii. 1033.

that this was only a "primacy of *honor*" not of *government*. So the "General Council" of Chalcedon, seventy years after: "We determine and decree concerning the privileges of the most holy Church of Constantinople, the New Rome. For the Fathers gave rank to the See of old Rome, *because that was the imperial city*. And one hundred and fifty devout bishops, *moved by the same consideration*, have granted *equal honor to the Holy See of New Rome*."*

After this, there was a continual "strife which should be the greatest" between the Bishops of Rome, and Constantinople, or "New Rome." In the year 588 one of the latter assumed the title of Universal Bishop, to which (St.) Gregory of Rome made the most earnest objections. He says, (not that this title belonged to *him* as Bishop of Old Rome, but,) "If every one of that Church assumes the name by which he *makes himself the head of all good men*, the Catholic Church (which God forbid should ever be the case) must needs be overthrown, when he falls who is called *Universal*." "I am bold to say that whoever adopts or affects the title of *Universal Prelate*, has the pride and character of *Antichrist*, etc. And indeed these two seem to split upon the same rock; for as pride makes Antichrist strain his pretensions up to God-head, so whoever is ambitious to be called the only PRELATE arrogates to himself a distinguished superiority and rises upon the ruins of the rest."† Yet would it be believed, that only eighteen years after this, (in 606,) the successor of Gregory, Boniface III., begged from the Emperor Phocas, a filthy and bloody tyrant, *this very title* of UNIVERSAL BISHOP, by which the Popes have ever since called themselves?‡ The Eastern Churches indeed never would submit to the claims of Rome. Yet this tendency toward absolute and slavish monarchy in the Church continued until in the Dark Ages that despotic power of the Popes was set up in Western Europe, which has remained the same in the main ever since.

* Labb. iv. 1734. † Ep. Greg. t. iii. 891. ‡ Spond. Epit. Baron. An. 606.

Q. What has been the effect of the Papal power upon the Catholic or Universal Church?

A. It has maintained false doctrine and tyranny, and greatly damaged the public unity of the Church. The Eastern Churches have been separated from the Western mainly on this account for a thousand years; and more than three hundred years ago the Reformed Churches protested against it.

Q. Is this error a harmless one otherwise?

A. It need only be stated in its length and breadth to be seen to be every way most pernicious. It is not merely the mistaken belief that Peter was Prince of the Apostles, or Roman Bishops of higher dignity than all others; but that (as the Roman Canon Law says) it is *necessary to salvation that every creature should be subject to the Roman Pontiff*.* Yes, *subject*; *subject* and *ABJECT*, so as to call this man, "*Our most Holy Lord*"! and esteem it an honor to kiss his toe.† *Subject*, so as to yield to his opinions and obey his commands in all things; so that, as (St.) Gregory says, "The Catholic Church must needs be overthrown *when he falls who is called Universal*"! We are to believe all this not only *without proof of Holy Scripture*, but AGAINST ITS WHOLE SPIRIT AND VERY WORDS.

* Ex. Com. l. i. t. 8.

† Ex. Com. tit. xiv. c. 4. "*Our Lord God, the Pope.*" "The Pope can not be accused of murder or adultery, when it would be equal to sacrilege to dispute of his doings." (Gloss. on Can. Law. tom. i. 194. Dist. 40.) One of the chief men in the Lat. Council thus addressed the Pope: "*Thou art another God upon earth.*" (Sess. 4.) Notice two facts, First, it is agreed by all that many of the Popes have been shockingly wicked men, and, secondly, the Roman Church has never cursed or burned the authors of these blasphemous flatteries, though lavish of curses and persecutions toward devout Protestants. (See further, p. .)

On the injurious assertion of Protestants, that the Pope is Antichrist.

CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Has this assertion any foundation in Scripture ?

A. That the Antichrist will come before the end of the world, the Scripture abundantly proves ; but that the Pope is that Antichrist, is not only unscriptural, but anti-scriptural.

Q. Where in Scripture do you find the insolent assertion refuted ?

A. In very many places. In Matt. 24, wars, famines, earthquakes, pestilence, false prophets, tribulation, *such as hath never been, nor shall be*, and all this before the *abomination of desolation* (the Antichrist) shall be seen standing in the holy place ; therefore, as these extraordinary scourges have not yet made their appearance, Antichrist has not yet come. In the same place, it is said, *the Gospel shall be preached in the whole world*, before the Antichrist and the *consummation* come. But the Gospel has not *yet* been preached in the whole world ; therefore the Antichrist has not yet come ; therefore the Popes, who have existed even since the time of Christ, can not be Antichrist.

Q. Have you any other texts ?

A. Yes ; texts in abundance. Daniel, chap. 7, connects the *abomination of desolation*, or the Antichrist, with the *placing of thrones* and the *sitting in judgment of the Ancient of days*. He gives power to the beast for a *time, times, and half a time*, or three years and a half, which exactly agrees with the period of his career fixed in the Apocalypse, (chap. 11,) forty-two months, or twelve hundred and sixty days. Therefore, Antichrist's reign is to be only three and a half years, and these immediately before the last judgment. But the Popes have reigned since the time of Christ ; therefore the Popes can not be Antichrist.

Q. What does the Apocalypse say, chap. 11 ?

A. That, during the above reign of Antichrist, during twelve hundred and sixty days, Henech and Elias will preach against him. But Henech and Elias have not yet come ; therefore, neither has Antichrist.

Q. What says 13th chap. of same Book ?

A. That Antichrist will mark on the *right hand or forehead* all his followers ; but the Pope has not done so ; therefore he is not Antichrist. Again, no man is to be allowed to buy or sell, but he that hath the character, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name. But Catholics have neither his character, nor name, nor number, nor has the Pope prevented them from buying or selling ; therefore, again, the Pope is not Antichrist.

Q. What do you find in Apoc. 13th chap. ?

A. That Antichrist is to open his mouth into blasphemies against God, to blaspheme his name and his tabernacle and them that dwell in heaven. But the Pope has made God's holy name honored and adored in every clime and at all times ; through him was the world converted to Christ ; it was he who converted all the Protestants from barbaric Paganism ; the Pope honors and venerates them that dwell in heaven—'tis Protestants who dishonor and blaspheme the angels and saints, *them that dwell in heaven* ; therefore, the Pope, at least, is not Antichrist. The above text would go far to prove that Antichrist is, or will be, a Protestant.

Q. What remark do you make on Apoc. 17 : 7 ?

A. It says : " The *beast* which thou sawest, *was* and *is not*, and shall come up out of the bottomless pit." But these words can not be verified in any Pope ; therefore, the Pope is not Antichrist.

Q. Is it clear from Scripture that Rome will be the seat of Antichrist ?

A. No ; it is much more evident that Jerusalem will be his seat. In the Gospel of St. Matt., chap. 24, Christ speaks first of the *temple of Jerusalem*, and immediately after connects this with the *abomination of desolation* to be seen standing in the *holy place* ; evidently pointing out that *temple* as the *holy place* where the *beast*

should be enthroned: and this is clearly confirmed by the Apoc. 11 : 8, where, speaking of the wars to be carried on by Antichrist, and of those that were to be slain by him, St. John says: "And their bodies shall lie in the streets of the *great city*, which is spiritually called Sodom and Egypt, WHERE THEIR LORD ALSO WAS CRUCIFIED." Now, the Lord was crucified in Jerusalem, not in Rome, therefore Jerusalem, not Rome, will be the seat of Antichrist. See also, on this subject, 11th, 12th, 13th, and 17th chaps. of Apocalypse.

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Is a great corruption of the Church foretold in the word of God?

A. Yes, plainly; see St. Paul in 2 Thess. 2 : 1-12, and 1 Tim. 4 : 1-3, etc.; also, St. John in Rev. 17, etc. The Doctrinal Catechism *carefully avoids* THESE WORDS of Scripture and talks about "Antichrist," etc., and other passages of Scripture, most of which we do *not* apply to the Roman Church. We shall be better able to judge of this matter at the end of this whole discussion. Reserve your judgment therefore until then.

On the Councils.

CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. How many kinds of Councils are there?

A. Two kinds; general and particular Councils.

Q. What is a general or œcumenical Council?

A. An assembly of bishops, to which all the bishops of the world are invited or summoned, presided over by the Pope, or his legates, or at least confirmed and approved by him.

Q. What is a particular, national, or provincial Council?

A. An assembly of bishops, to which are invited all the bishops of a nation or province.

Q. Can a Council err in its decision on any matter of faith?

A. General or œcumenical Councils are infallible in matters of faith; not so, particular Councils.

Q. Why do you say that a general Council is infallible?

A. Because, if a general Council erred in a matter of faith, the whole Church would be in error; now this can not be, because the gates of hell shall never prevail against the Church.

Q. Why do you say the whole Church would err, if a general Council taught error?

A. Because the bishops assembled in a general Council represent the whole Church, and any error taught by them is consequently an error of the whole Church.

Q. In what light, then, are we to look on the decision of a general Council?

A. As the decision of the Holy Ghost.

Q. How does St. Peter speak at the first general Council? Acts 15: 28.

A. "It hath," he says, "*seemed good to the HOLY GHOST and to us*, to lay no farther burden upon you."

Q. Is it a great sin to refuse submission to a general Council?

A. It is the greatest act of criminal pride and presumption, accompanied by the awful guilt of heresy or schism, or both. We call it extremely criminal, as well as irrational; because the man who will not submit, prefers his own single opinion—and this in a matter, regarding which he is neither qualified nor authorized to judge—to the deliberately formed decision of an immense assemblage of the best qualified, and most competently authorized, legitimate judges.

Q. May it not be said, that we are obliged to abide by the decisions of a general Council, only when these are in accordance with the word of God?

A. This is a mere piece of sophistry; it supposes that the Church may teach what is opposed to God's word. Now, this is impossible; for in that case, God must have failed in his word—his Holy Spirit, as he promised,

would not have taught his Church all truth forever—the gates of hell would have prevailed against her. God did not tell the world to be guided by what *they thought* conformable to the Scripture—he sent his pastors *to teach all nations*, and told the nations, that he who would not believe these should be condemned.

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Has God in his holy word any where commanded the Church to assemble “General Councils” to decide upon doctrine?

A. *No where whatever.* Even the Doctrinal Catechism does not say this.

Q. Might it not be well enough to have such Councils in which the whole Church throughout the world would be fairly represented and could so consult together?

A. Though not necessary, as we have all necessary doctrine plainly laid down in the word of God, it might sometimes be *convenient* when there was a good understanding among all the Churches.

Q. In such a Council would the Bishop of Rome (or Pope) have any greater authority than any other bishop?

A. No.

Q. Might not even such a fair council of the Universal Church err in doctrine?

A. Yes; for they are but men not inspired by God. It has been already shown that the greater part of the Church not only *may* but actually *has* erred.

Q. What evil behavior and false doctrines can you prove against several of the very Councils called “general and infallible” by the Roman Church? (See p. 210.)

A. The following among others, namely: (St.) Gregory Naz. says of most of the bishops of his time who made up the first Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381): “As for what concerns the faith, they were prepared for either part, not observing the laws of God but of the times.”* Even Card. Baronius, An. 381, says

* Op. ii. 304.

that "with the exception of a few," "*most of these bishops had their faith changeable according to worldly advantage.*"* Of the Council of Ephesus, (A.D. 431,) Dupin, a very learned member of the Roman Church, says: "It may be said of this Council with a great deal more truth what St. Gregory Naz. said of the Councils of his time, '*That he never saw an assembly of bishops that had a good and happy conclusion* ; that they always increased the distemper rather than cured it ; that the obstinate contests and the ambition of overcoming and domineering which ordinarily reigns among them are prejudicial, and ordinarily those who are concerned to judge others are moved thereto by ill-will rather than by a design to restrain the faults of others.' *This seems to agree with the Council of Ephesus better than any other assembly of bishops.*"† So much for the behavior of two of these Councils ; now for doctrine.

The second Council of Nice decreed that images should be worshipped, and declared all who opposed this accursed. The fourth Lateran Council, (at Rome, 1215,) the most numerous of all, decreed: "Let the secular powers be warned and induced, and if need be, *condemned by ecclesiastical censure*, that"—"they publicly take an oath, for the defense of the faith, that they will study in good earnest to *exterminate to their utmost power* from the lands subject to their jurisdiction *all heretics denoted by the Church.*" "But if the temporal lord, *required and warned by the Church*, shall neglect to *purge his territory of this heretical filth*, etc., let that be signified to the Pope, that he" "may *expose his country to be seized on by Catholics*, who, THE HERETICS BEING EXTERMINATED, *may peaceably possess it.*‡ The Council of Constance justified treachery and perjury, (see p. 393,) and others of these Councils decreed what was false and wicked. Besides, none of them were fair assemblies of the Church, as none but bishops could vote in them, (the laity having no voice whatever,) and

* Bar. Ann. An. 381.

† Ecc. Hist. Cent. v. 214.

‡ Carranza, Sum. Gen. Conc. i. 297. (Rom. Can. Law. Dec. Inn. iii. vol. ii. p. 758?)

only such bishops as happened to attend, usually only a small part (sometimes not one tenth) of the whole. In fact within the first four hundred years, *more Councils with more bishops in them* decided AGAINST THE HOLY TRINITY than for it!

Q. What then must we say of the calling the decisions of such assemblies "the decision of the Holy Ghost"?

A. It is blasphemy.

Q. Do St. Peter's words "at the first Council,"* authorize such language?

A. That was an assembly held by the holy Apostles themselves, and they were some of the chief "holy men of old who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."†

Q. Is it "a great sin" in any one not to yield to the judgment of these councils against his own judgment and conscience?

A. To attempt to do this would be rather a sin, after what has been *proved* of the false doctrines and contradictions of Councils. Indeed the chief writers of the Roman Church (Bellarmine, etc.,) refuse to allow that a general Council is superior to a Pope, *though the Council of Constance has so decreed!*‡

CHAP. II.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. How many general Councils have been held?

A. Besides that held by the Apostles and first Pastors of the Church, eighteen others have been held.

Q. Where and when were the four first general Councils held?

A. The first at Nice in 325, the second at Constantinople in 381, the third at Ephesus in 431, the fourth at Chalcedon in 451.

* You will find the Doctrinal Catechism on this very page, calling the Council of Nice (A.D. 323) "the first Council."

† 2 Pet. 1: 21: "For prophecy came not by the will of man at any time but the holy men of God spoke inspired by the Holy Ghost."—Douay Bible.

‡ Labb. xvi. 67.

Q. How many general Councils were held at Constantinople?

A. Four in all; in the years 381, 553, 680, 869, respectively.

Q. How many at Rome?

A. Four; in the years 1123, 1139, 1179, 1215.

Q. How many at Nice?

A. Two; the first in 325, the second in 787.

Q. How many at Lyons?

A. Two; one in 1245, the other in 1274. A general Council was held at Vienne in 1311, one at Florence in 1439; one at Constance in 1414.

Q. What was the last general Council?

A. The Council of Trent.

Q. Why do you place that of Trent amongst the general Councils?

A. Because all the bishops of the Christian world were invited to it; the Pope by his legates presided over it, and confirmed its decisions.

Q. How many ecclesiastical dignitaries attended it?

A. There were six Cardinals, three Patriarchs, thirty-two Archbishops, and two hundred and twenty-eight Bishops.

Q. Were the Lutheran and Calvinist ministers invited to assist at it?

A. Yes; they were entreated to attend, and every safe-conduct they could desire offered them; it was their own fault that they were not present.

Q. Are Protestants bound to obey the decisions of this Council of Trent?

A. Certainly; because these decisions emanated from the lawfully constituted judges of the true Church of Christ.

Q. Who are the lawful judges of Christian doctrine?

A. Only the bishops of the true Church, who have been appointed by Christ for that purpose.

Q. Repeat the words of St. Paul to the *ancients* or bishops of the Church. Acts 20 : 28.

A. "Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops to *RULE the Church of God.*"

Q. What remarks do you make on this passage ?

A. The bishops are under the guidance of the Holy Ghost to rule or govern the Church ; this they could not do, unless they were qualified to distinguish, with the utmost certainty, good from bad doctrine.

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Do all Christians generally in the world allow that the eighteen "General Councils" mentioned by the Doctrinal Catechism, had a right to speak for the Universal Church ?

A. No ; the Eastern Churches reject more than half of them, the Reformed Churches declare that all such assemblies may err, and that most of those did err greatly ; and the *members of the Roman Church* themselves are not agreed about them, some eminent persons* among them rejecting some of these eighteen, and maintaining that there have been other "General Councils," (as at Pisa, in 1409, and at Basle, in 1431.)

Q. What of the Council of Trent ?

A. It was one of the worst of them all. It was dictated to by the Popes, and, indeed, only attended by their special friends. All the histories of its debates and proceedings agree in showing that there was neither free discussion nor fair voting in it.

Q. Are Protestants bound by its decisions because Lutheran and Calvinistic ministers were invited to be present at it ?

A. We are not bound by what any one did then, but must judge for ourselves, before God, of what he has told us in his written word. But if these ministers had been present, they would have been voted down in spite of the clear words of Holy Scripture on their side. However, they did well not to go ; or else, *like John Huss and Jerome of Prague at Constance*, they might have been (NOTWITHSTANDING "SAFE CONDUCTS") laid hold of and burned to death for heresy ! (See p. 393.)

Q. What do you say of the words of St. Paul quoted by the Doctrinal Catechism : "Take heed to yourselves," etc. ? (Acts 20 : 28.)

* Bossuet, Dupin, and Fleury.

A. These words are badly translated by the Roman Church. (Here they are as fairly given in the English Bible: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God.") Yet the main sense is the same. This was addressed to the presbyters (priests) of *one Church*, that of Ephesus. If they mean what the Doctrinal Catechism claims, *any one bishop or pastor* is "*qualified to distinguish with the utmost certainly good from bad doctrine.*" Does the Roman Church say that? Remember, "*with the utmost certainty*"! WHY THEN HAVE ANY COUNCILS AT ALL?



On the Obedience due to the Church.

CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Are we obliged to obey the Church?

A. Yes; because our Saviour says, Matt. 18:17: "If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican."

Q. What does Christ say to the pastors of the Church? Luke 10:16.

A. "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me."

Q. What says St. Paul? Heb. 13:17.

A. "Obey your prelates, and be subject to them; for they watch, as being to render an account for your souls."

Q. Are we bound, in conscience, to obey the ecclesiastical, as well as the civil powers?

A. Yes; because both are instituted by the appointment of God. St. Paul, Rom. 13:1, 2, 3, etc.: "Let every soul be subject to *higher powers*; for there is *no*

power but from God : and those that are, are ordained of God ; therefore, he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God ; and they that resist purchase to themselves damnation, . . . wherefore be subject of necessity, not only for wrath, but also *for conscience sake.*"

Q. What follows from these passages ?

A. That we are obliged to obey the civil authorities, and to observe the commandments of the Church.

Q. But are not the commandments of the Church the mere commandments of men ?

A. True ; but we are obliged to keep the commandments of men, for God ordains it ; for example, the command of a father, or a magistrate, is only the commandment of man ; yet we are bound to observe both, because God so ordains ; thus also are we bound to obey the Church, because it is the command of God that we should do so.

Q. Does not Christ say, Matt. 15 : 9 : "In vain do they worship me, teaching doctrines and commandments of men" ?

A. Yes ; but Christ speaks here of vain and useless human commandments, not in accordance with, but opposed to, his law.

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What do the words of Holy Scripture quoted here by the Doctrinal Catechism fairly mean ?

A. That I ought to pay that reasonable and loving respect to the authority of my pastors in the Church, which is proper in a humble Christian.

Q. Does this bind me to believe every thing which they teach, however false it may seem to me, and to do whatever they command, however unreasonable I may think it ?

A. By no means. I can not give a *reasonable* service to our Lord and Saviour in obeying those whom he has placed over me, except as my judgment and conscience agree to what they say.

CHAP. II.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. To what purpose are the Commandments of the Church?

A. They serve to lead us to the better observance of the commandments of God. Thus the law of God ordains, that we render to him the worship that is due to him—that we should fast and confess our sins, and receive the holy communion; but the law of God does not tell us how, or when, or how often, it is necessary to perform these acts of religion; he has left it to the Church to settle these matters of detail.

Q. Has the Church any right to appoint feast-days?

A. The Christian Church has surely a right, which even the Jewish Church possessed.

Q. Where do you find, in the Old Testament, *feasts of precept* instituted by the synagogue?

A. In the Book of Esther, chap. 9th, and in the last chapter of the Book of Judith.

Q. Have you any other way of proving that the Church has power to institute festivals of precept?

A. Had she not such power, she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her; she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday, the seventh day, a change for which there is no Scriptural authority.

Q. Has the Church power to appoint days of fasting?

A. Certainly; for St. Augustine, one of the bishops of the early and *confessedly* pure Church, taxes Aerius with heresy, for having disputed that right.

Q. Can the Church forbid us the use of certain kinds of food on particular days?

A. Yes; for she did so even in the time of the Apostles, Acts 15:29: "That you abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled."

Q. If the Christians of these times had used these forbidden meats, would they have committed sin?

A. Certainly ; because, in that case, they would have violated a commandment of the Church.

Q. May not Protestants say, that that which entereth by the mouth defileth not the man ?

A. Yes ; but we reply it is not the meat, it is the disobedience, which renders the man unclean ; and we ask them, where did Adam and Eve put the fatal apple ? Besides, in the passage alluded to, Matt. 15 : 11, Christ is speaking, not of food taken in opposition to a precept of his Church, but merely of food taken with unwashed hands.

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Has the Universal Church ever made such laws in regard to fasts and other such rites, as bind all its members now ?

A. No one can prove that it ever has. But different national, and other particular Churches have done so.

Q. Are members of any such Church bound to observe all rites and ceremonies which it may decree ?

A. They should pay great regard to them, provided there be nothing in them unscriptural or superstitious, or naturally tending that way.

Q. Can any Church properly “forbid the use of certain kinds of food on particular days” ?

A. Hardly ; since such *artificial self-denials* tend to make men think that they are *justified by their own acts*. We have many warnings by our Lord, against this tendency to make much of *outward* and *bodily* religion, and forget *inward* and *spiritual holiness*. (Matt. 15, Mark 7, etc.) So St. Paul makes it one of the marks of a FALSE CHURCH—“commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received, etc.”*

Q. But have such commandments of a Church been made proper by what the Council at Jerusalem did ?

A. No : that was what *the holy Apostles, by the direct authority of God*, enjoined upon the Christians *of those days*, so that they might not at all countenance false re-

* 1 Tim. 4 : 3 : “To abstain from meats which God hath created to be received,” etc.—Douay Bible.

ligion, (by "eating meat offered to idols,") or needlessly offend the zealous Jews, who were shocked at the eating of blood, etc. That is a very different thing from commanding men to abstain from *all* flesh on certain days of the week. Notice the whole of the very words of the Apostles: "For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to *lay upon you no greater burden* than these *necessary things*; that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Farewell."*

CHAP. III.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Why does the Church forbid certain meats on particular days?

A. Not that in these meats there is any thing unclean, but to chastise and mortify the body.

Q. Were there not some heretics in ancient times, who termed certain kinds of food unclean, and the creatures of the devil?

A. Yes; the Marcionites and Manicheans; and this doctrine of theirs is styled by the Apostle the doctrine of the devil.

Q. Is it a very ancient Christian practice to abstain from the use of flesh meat two days in the week?

A. Yes; this practice commenced with Christianity itself; for St. Epiphanius, in his Catechetical Instructions, says: "*An Apostolic law* has ordained a fast of two days in the week."

Q. Were Friday and Saturday the two days of abstinence always observed over the whole Christian Church?

A. No; in some places the Wednesday and Friday were the days observed; and as to these disciplinary portions of Christian doctrine, it is proper, as St. Jerome remarks, to conform to the usages of the Church where we may happen to dwell.

* Acts 15 : 28, 29 : "For it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay no farther burden upon you, than these necessary things, that you abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which things keeping yourselves you shall do well. Fare ye well."—Douay Bible.

Q. Why have the Greeks appointed Wednesdays and Fridays, as their days of abstinence?

A. Because Christ was sold or betrayed on Wednesday, and put to death on Friday.

Q. Why does the Western, or Latin Church, observe Friday and Saturday?

A. In honor of the death and burial of Jesus Christ.

Q. Does not the Apostle blame the Colossians for saying, "Touch not, taste not, handle not;" and again: "Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat or in drink"? (Coloss. 2 : 16.)

A. The Apostle is speaking here of the Jewish distinctions between meats; they considered some meats in themselves clean, and others unclean; it is this false and superstitious notion, as well as other abrogated Jewish observances, that the Apostle here condemns; and this is quite evident from the words immediately following those above quoted: "Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a festival day, OR OF THE NEW MOON, OR OF THE SABBATHS."

Q. Does he not say, 2 Cor. 3 : 17: "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty"?

A. Why, this text may be quoted with as good a grace to throw off the whole law of God. "Liberty;" yes; but a rational and religious liberty consistent with the obligations and duties of one bound to observe the laws of Christ. "*Free*," as St. Peter says, "as *free*, and not as making LIBERTY a cloak for malice, but as the servants of God." (1 Peter 2 : 16.)

CHAP. III.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Is it true that "the custom of abstaining from flesh meat two days of the week began with Christianity itself"?

A. *No*: there is not the slightest mention of such a custom of *Christians*, or allusion to it in the New Testament. No Christian writer mentions it until long after the Apostles.* Yet such fastings were common

* The earliest "Father" cited by the Doctrinal Catechism, is Epiphanius, whom Dupin calls, "very credulous, and not very accurate."

in the religion of Jews and pagans around them, from whom they did begin to copy them after a while.

Q. Is there any harm in such abstinence from flesh?

A. There is nothing either good or bad in it, if we keep from superstition.

Q. Does one by this show more honor to the death and burial of our Lord?

A. I can best honor him by seeking to have a pure heart and a heavenly spirit through *all* the days of the week.

Q. So far from recommending that sort of piety which makes much of "meat and drink," does not St. Paul directly discourage it, in the Epistle to the Colossians, chap. 2?

A. Yes, and very strongly. He tells us to *employ all our self-denial upon resisting evil desires*, and doing our duties to others, (chap. 3.) This unnecessarily distressing the body "after the commandments and doctrines of men," he says has "indeed *a show* of wisdom in humility and will-worship," but is perilous to the *spiritual* service of God. The Doctrinal Catechism says this only meant the "false and superstitious notion" among the Jews about the superior piety of some kinds of food rather than some others. If these people then fell into false and superstitious errors about what God himself had ordained by Moses, we certainly are in at least equal danger from mere human rites.

CHAP. IV.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Who established Lent?

A. The Apostles.

Q. How do you prove this?

A. Firstly, by the rule of St. Augustine; and secondly, by the testimony of the Fathers.

Q. What is St. Augustine's rule? (Epist. 18th.)

A. "Every practice received by the *whole Church*, whose origin can not be traced to any bishop, or Pope, or Council, must be regarded as an *Apostolical institution*." Now, Lent has been observed in all Christian

ages and nations, and can not be traced to any merely human source posterior to the time of the Apostles; therefore it was instituted by the Apostles.

Q. What do you reply to those who say it was invented by the Council of Nice?

A. That this can not be true; for Tertullian and Origen, who lived before that Council, make mention of it in their writings.

Q. Do you know any Father who has expressly declared that Lent was instituted by the Apostles?

A. Yes; St. Jerom and St. Leo declare it formally; the former, Epist. ad Marcel., says, "Following the Apostolical institution, we observe a fast of forty days;" the latter, Serm. 9 de Jejun: "It was the Apostles, who, by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, established Lent."

Q. Were people, in these times, *obliged in conscience* to fast during Lent?

A. Yes; for St. Jerome, Epist. ad Marcel., says: "The Montanists fast three Lents in the year; we fast only *one*. That they observe three is a voluntary act of their own; but we observe *one*, *because we are obliged*." St. Augustine says: "Our fast at any other time is voluntary; but during Lent, we sin if we do not fast."

CHAP. IV.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. When did the fast of Lent begin to be observed in the Church?

A. Not long after the Apostles, if not in their days. We find the first notice of it in the writings of (St.) Irenæus, seventy years after the death of St. John.

Q. What of the positive statements of Jerome and Leo, that Lent was instituted by the Apostles?

A. They lived three hundred or four hundred years later. The origin of Lent was probably in their day (as it is to us) somewhat obscure, and there was, of course, a disposition to ascribe every such thing to the founders of the Church.

Q. Is Augustine's rule to that effect reasonable?

A. No. This is one of the less wise things which that good and great man, who was somewhat influenced by the growing superstitions of the times, has written.* Any practice may arise by degrees, so as to be traced to no particular persons for its beginning.

CHAP. V.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Why did the Apostles institute the fast of Lent?

A. First, in honor of our Saviour's fast of forty days; secondly, in honor of his passion; and, thirdly, to prepare ourselves, in the spirit of mortification, for the better celebration of the Easter solemnity.

Q. In what manner should Lent be observed?

A. We ought to attend in this to the Lenten Instructions of our respective bishops; to abstain from the use of flesh meat on the days its use is prohibited; to take only one meal about noon, and a slight collation in the evening. The sick are under no restrictions, when the nature of the disease requires a relaxation of the law; and if a sufficient reason be given to the lawful superior, the collation may be taken in the morning.

Q. Are all Christians bound to fast?

A. No; various classes are exempted: 1st, all under twenty-one years of age; 2dly, all the aged who can be prudently deemed too weak to fast; 3dly, women with child, and nurses; 4thly, all that are engaged in heavy and laborious employments; and, 5thly, the poor, who are never certain of sufficient and regular food.

CHAP. V.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Is it well to keep Lent?

A. Yes, if I do so with a truly pious, humble, and spiritual mind, honestly seeking to be made less worldly,

* Yet there is nothing of the kind in his 18th letter. Has he said this any where? On page 237 the Doctrinal Catechism gives a false translation of his words.

and more spiritual. We may thus be better prepared to celebrate our Lord's death and resurrection at the end of the solemn season.

Q. Ought I to do this because the Church enjoins it?

A. Yes; for there need be no superstition in this, but rather the purest piety, and great profit to my soul. I thus join with most of my brethren now in the world, as well as almost all Christians from very near the very days of the Lord.

Q. How ought Lent to be kept?

A. Chiefly with much humble confession in my soul to God, and many prayers for his mercy; also with such honest self-denial, both in food and amusements, according to the example of the old saints, and of the Lord himself, as, without injuring my health or temper, may remind me how selfish and worldly I am prone to be, and how I ought to humble myself before God for this.

Q. Did the first Christians, in this Fast make any difference between flesh meat and any other kind of food?

A. No. With them it was an honest *fast*, in which they no more thought of enjoying good things made with fish and vegetables, than nice dishes of meat.

CHAP. VI.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What should a Catholic reply to those who scoff and rail at fasting and abstinence?

A. He should tell them, that those who will not hear the Church, are declared, by Christ himself, to be as heathens or publicans. He should repeat to them the words of St. Augustine: "It is an impudent folly to blame that which is practised by the *whole Church*."

Q. Upon whom does this reproach fall with full force?

A. Upon Luther, in an especial manner, who blamed fasting, although practised over the whole Church.

Q. Can you prove, by any Scriptural example, that Catholics do well to abstain from certain kinds of food?

A. Yes ; the prophet Jeremias praised the Rechabites for abstaining from wine, because Jonadab, their father, had forbidden them the use of it ; hence, the Catholics can not do evil by abstaining from any particular food, when the Church, *their mother*, orders them to do so.

Q. In what manner can we show a Protestant, that he speaks unreasonably against fasts and abstinences ?

A. Ask him why he keeps Sunday, and not Saturday, as his day of rest, since he is unwilling either to fast or to abstain. If he reply, that the Scripture orders him to keep the Sunday, but says nothing as to fasting and abstinence, tell him the Scripture speaks of Saturday or the Sabbath, but gives no command any where regarding Sunday, or the first day of the week. If, then, he neglects Saturday as a day of rest and holiness, and substitutes Sunday in its place, and this merely because such was the usage of the ancient Church, should he not, if he wishes to act consistently, observe fasting and abstinence, because the ancient Church so ordained ?

CHAP. VI.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Has the Roman Church erred in making such burdensome and formal rules about fasting, instead of leaving it more to the private consciences of men ?

A. Yes ; for this is not only doing what the Apostles, in the Council of Jerusalem, refused to do—"Laying on Christians greater burdens than *necessary* things ;" but it also tempts them to neglect the *necessary* things, and (what we have already seen to be a dreadful mistake) to think that they are *justified* by these fastings, instead of trusting in the mere mercy of God in our Lord Jesus Christ.

Q. Does the Word of God warn us against this ?

A. Yes, *often* ; for it is one of the errors of many false religions. Our Lord and his Apostles often speak thus of it. "Commanding to abstain from meats," is, as we have seen, foretold as a mark of those "who shall depart from the faith ;" and St. Paul adds, that

“bodily exercise profiteth little;”* that is, mere bodily acts, such as eating or fasting, have little to do with real religion. Our Lord says: “Not that which goeth into a man defileth him.”†

Q. Have we no other reason for *keeping the Lord's day holy* than members of the Roman Church have for observing all of its fasts?

A. Yes, truly. It is the **FOURTH COMMANDMENT OF God**, that men should keep holy *one day in seven*. The whole Church could never have *set this law aside*; but it had the right to change the holy day from the *seventh* day of the week (Saturday) to the *first*, (Sunday, or more properly, “the Lord's day,”) in honor of our Lord's rising from the dead on that day. *This was done from the very days of the Apostles*. These Roman *fasts*, on the other hand, are not only not commanded by God, but were never even enjoined by the whole Church, and many of the rules of them never heard of until the Dark Ages.



On the Sacraments.

CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. How do you prove that there are seven sacraments?

A. From the Holy Scripture and the dogmatical decisions, as well as the constant traditions, of the Church.

Q. Where do you find in Scripture that there are seven sacraments?

A. We find in Scripture seven outward signs of invisible grace, instituted by Jesus Christ, as so many means to confer grace on our souls; this is easily shown of each sacrament in particular.

* 1 Tim. 4 : 8 : “For bodily exercise is profitable to little.”—Douay Bible.

† Matt. 15 : 11 : “Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man.”—Douay Bible.

Q. Do all Catholics profess that there are seven sacraments?

A. Yes; all the Catholics in the world, in number about two hundred and fifty-six millions, believe in seven sacraments.

Q. Do the Greek schismatics recognize the same number?

A. Yes; all the Greek schismatics recognize the same number of sacraments as the Catholic Church, and these schismatics are in number about fifty-six and a half millions; so that three hundred and twelve millions and a half—that is, nearly the half of the whole human race—hold the Catholic faith on this subject; whilst the whole Protestant population of the world, opposed to it, only amount to about forty-six millions. Jeremias, the schismatical Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, declared the belief of the schismatical Greek Church in the seven sacraments, anno 1576; and others have repeated that declaration at various times since that period.

Q. What do you conclude from all this?

A. That the whole Christian world, morally speaking, do now believe, and have at all times believed, in seven sacraments; for had the seven sacraments been a modern invention, the Greek schismatical Church, which has been separated from us for nine hundred years, would not have had these sacraments, in number and nature, just as we have them.

Q. Have Protestants been always agreed as to the number of the sacraments?

A. No; some admitted two—baptism, and what they call the Lord's Supper; others admitted four and even five, and some admitted only three, as is evident from the Confession of Augsburg, Apol. art. 7, which says expressly, that "penance is a sacrament in the proper sense of the word."

Q. What inference would a man of reflection draw from these Protestant inconsistencies?

A. That Protestants were compelled to frame their religion, not according to Holy Writ, but according to the corrupt maxims of their followers; the question with their founders was, not what does Christ teach, but what will our partisans receive as doctrine from our

hands? Hence, they taught one doctrine to-day and another to-morrow, one doctrine in this country, and another in that, in order to suit themselves and their religion to the changes of time, place, and passion.

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Is the word "SACRAMENT" found in the word of God?

A. No.

Q. What does it mean and why is it used among Christians?

A. It means a holy ceremony and sign.* It has therefore been used almost from the first days of the Church to describe specially *those two rites* which Christ our Lord established in *his own person and words* to be *used by every member of the Church*.

Q. What are these sacraments?

A. Baptism and the Lord's Supper, (otherwise called the Holy Communion or Eucharist,) in the former of which we set forth our entrance into the Church, and in the latter our continuance in it.

Q. What shall we say of *seven* sacraments which some reckon?

A. That is a mere question of *words*; for "*sacrament*" as used by the old writers, (as we shall see,) did not always mean the same thing. Yet if this definition of the word be allowed, (which all now consent to,) namely, "an outward and visible sign with an inward and spiritual grace signified by it, instituted by Christ himself," it can apply only to the two things mentioned above. The very foolish arguments (see pp. 236—) used by some to prove that "*Christ himself*" instituted *marriage* or *confirmation*, in order to make them sacraments in that sense, show this plainly enough.

Q. When then and whence arose this notion of "*seven sacraments*"?

A. It is a fantastic opinion brought forward in the Dark Ages, because the number *seven* was fancied to

* So Augustine defines it. De Civ. Dei. x. c. 5. "Sacrament, that is, holy sign."

be peculiarly sacred. There are *seven days of the week, etc., etc.*—therefore there must be SEVEN SACRAMENTS!

Q. Give some one of the many proofs that this *was not* the belief at first?

A. Not only is there no trace of it in the *first* Christian writers, but as late as the fifth century, (St.) Augustine says: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, as he declares in the Gospel, subjects us to a yoke that is easy, and a burden that is light. Hence he has gathered the society of his new people by *sacraments* IN NUMBER MOST SMALL, in observance most easy, in signification most excellent; as *Baptism* consecrated in the name of the Trinity, and *the Communication of his body and blood.*"*

Q. Do not some of the early writers sometimes call other things "sacraments"?

A. Yes; but in the loose general sense of "a holy thing or sign." This is evident from their using the same term of "sacrament" for *preaching*, † *the Sabbath of the Jews*, ‡ (as one of the sacraments of their religion,) and many other things which no one pretends to call "sacraments" in the strict sense. When, however, they come to speak of "THE SACRAMENTS," it is always the *two* above. It was not until two hundred years after Augustine that they began to enumerate Confirmation also among the sacraments, making *three in all*!§

Q. What shall we say of the argument of *numbers* used by the Doctrinal Catechism?

A. It is unworthy of a serious inquiry into true religion. By that reasoning the first Christians ought to have given up to the Jews, and both to the Pagans; and so indeed ought we all now to join those who believe in many gods. Our Lord says: "Broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and *many there be* who go in thereat; because strait is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there

* Op. ii. 93. Ep. Jan.

† (St.) Hilary. In Matt. Can. 12 : 25.

‡ (St.) August. De Civ. Dei. vi. ii. § (St.) Isid. Hisp. Orig. vi. 39.

be that find it."* But as we have already seen (p. 79) these figures are very incorrect. The Greek Church also went on with the Roman for many hundred years in the growing corruptions of religion, though at last stopping short of it and separating from it in this career.

Q. Has the Protestant Episcopal Church ever spoken of more than two sacraments?

A. No, neither in England nor this country.

CHAP. II.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Can Protestants prove to Baptists, that the baptism of infants is good and useful?

A. No; they can not; because, according to Protestant principles, such baptism is useless.

Q. Why do you say this?

A. One of the Protestant principles is, that no human being can be justified, except by an act of faith in Jesus Christ; but no infant is capable of making this act of faith; therefore, upon Protestant principles, the baptism of infants is useless.

Q. Can you draw the same consequence from any other principle?

A. Yes; their first principle is, that nothing is to be practised, which is not authorized by Scriptural example; but it does not appear from Scripture, that even one infant was ever baptized; therefore Protestants should reject, on their own principle, infant baptism as an unscriptural usage.

Q. How do Baptists treat other Protestants?

A. They boast that the Scripture is evidently for Baptist practice—that other Protestants hold traditional doctrines, like the Catholics. They quote Matt., chap. 28, "*Go teach* all nations, baptizing them," from

* Matt. 7 : 13, 14 : "Broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there are who go in thereat. How narrow is the gate and strait is the way that leadeth to life; and few there are that find it."—Douay Bible.

which they say, it is clear, that *teaching* should go before baptism ; hence, they conclude, that as infants can not be taught, so neither should they be baptized, until they are capable of teaching or instruction.

Q. What use do they make of Mark, chap. 16 : "He who *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved" ?

A. They say it is evident that belief or faith must precede baptism ; but, they add, children or infants are not capable of believing ; therefore neither are they capable of being baptized.

Q. What can Protestants reply to this Baptist reasoning ?

A. They may give these passages another meaning, but they can never prove that their interpretation is better than that of the Baptists, because they themselves give every one a right to interpret Scripture.

Q. What inference do you draw from this ?

A. That every Protestant has much reason to doubt whether he be baptized.

Q. How do Catholics prove that infants ought to be baptized ?

A. Not from Scripture alone, which is not clear on this subject, but from the Scripture illustrated by the constant tradition of the Church, which, in every age, administered baptism to infants, and consequently the practice must have been derived from the Apostles.

Q. Can Protestants use this triumphant argument of tradition against the Baptists ?

A. No ; they have no right to use it in this matter, where it would serve them, since they reject it in every question where it is opposed to their novel and lately-invented doctrines.

Q. What is the outward or visible sign in baptism ?

A. The pouring of water on the person, and the words, "I baptize thee," etc., pronounced by the minister.

Q. What is the inward or invisible grace conferred ?

A. The sanctifying grace of God, by which the soul is regenerated, cleansed from all sin, made the child of God, a member of his Church, and an heir of heaven.

Q. Where do you find, in Scripture, that Christ instituted baptism ?

A. In many places, but particularly in the passage

where he gives his commission to the Apostles, Matt. 28 : 19 : "Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Q. Does it appear from Scripture that baptism remits sins ?

A. Yes ; St. Peter, Acts 2 : 28, says : "Do penance, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins."

Q. Is baptism necessary to salvation ?

A. Yes ; for Christ says, John 3 : 3, 5, "Verily, verily, I say to thee, except a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he can not enter into the kingdom of God ;" and in Mark, chap. 16 : "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved."

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. In what words did our Lord establish the sacrament of baptism ?

A. He said to the Apostles, and through them to all his pastors : "Go ye, therefore, and teach (or make disciples of, that is, *scholars*, for so the word means) all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."*

Q. Does it seem from this, that none but grown persons could be his disciples—that children could not be admitted among his people or Church, like others, by baptism ?

A. No. They are certainly human beings, a part of "all nations ;" if any thing, the most suitable *scholars* of our Lord, as being both more ignorant and more teachable than others. And this the Lord and Master himself seems to say in these words : "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God."†

* Matt. 28 : 19 : "Going, therefore teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name," etc.—Douay Bible.

† Mark 10 : 14. So the Douay Bible.

Q. When, therefore, ought they to be admitted into the Church?

A. As soon after their birth as may be. Then even before their first distinct knowledge of good and evil, they may find themselves in the fold of the Good Shepherd. So from the first they may be taught and grow up to trust in our Lord for pardon with a penitent and obedient spirit, and with continual prayer.

Q. Did the first Christians always understand our Lord's commandment and sacrament of baptism in this way?

A. Yes; even the Doctrinal Catechism says that the Church "in every age administered baptism to infants."

Q. In this do we rest upon "the triumphant argument of tradition"?

A. No; we take the plain words of our Lord, "Go ye," etc.; but as some say that this was not meant to include infants, we refer to the fact that it was from the first understood to include them.

Q. What if they say that there is "no example of it in the New Testament"?

A. This is as if any one should say of the other sacrament, that, because there is no distinct mention in Scripture of any *woman's* partaking of it, that therefore *none but men* ought now to *communicate*. "No," says one, "such a notion was never heard of among the first Christians, which shows that women were included in the general duty of that sacrament;" which is just what we say of *infants* and *baptism*. Thus we read that when Lydia was converted, "she was baptized *and her household*."*

Q. What do we say to those who object that infants *can not repent and believe*?

A. That our gracious Lord provides for this helplessness of theirs by permitting others to make these vows for them, so that they may grow up in his Church, repenting and believing for themselves as they begin to understand these things. Yet he leaves them to their own free will in this, that if when they come to years of distinct choice they do not publicly take these vows upon themselves, they in fact quit the Church. Does

* Acts 16 : 15. So the Douay Bible.

the Roman Church prefer the arguments of the Baptists to this ?

Q. What is the "outward sign" in this sacrament, and what the "spiritual thing signified" ?

A. The *outward sign* is water applied to the person baptized with the words : "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The spiritual thing signified by this is a change called a "new birth" made in the soul of the baptized person, by which his sins are all forgiven, and he begins to love God. This change depends upon his truly repenting and believing then or as soon after as he is able to do so, or his having already done so. It does not, therefore, necessarily occur at the moment of outward baptism. Thus our Lord forbids us to be too curious about the circumstances of the "new birth," but to be content with the marks and fruits of it in the conduct of any person, saying, "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and *thou canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth ; so is every one that is born of the Spirit.*"*

CHAP. III.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Why do you consider Confirmation one of the sacraments ?

A. Because it is a visible sign of invisible grace.

Q. What is the visible sign in Confirmation ?

A. The unction of Holy Chrism, and the imposition of the hands of the bishop.

Q. What is the invisible grace conferred by this sacrament ?

A. A grace of the Holy Ghost, which strengthens and secures the faith of the Christian.

Q. Where do you find Confirmation mentioned in Scripture ?

A. In the 8th chap. of the Acts, it is said, that the Samaritans, having received the Word of God, were

* John 3 : 8 : "The Spirit breatheth where he will, and thou hearest his voice, but thou knowest not whence he cometh, and whither he goeth : so is every one that is born of the Spirit."—Douay Bible.

baptized by St. Philip; and the Apostles “sent unto them Peter and John, who, when they were come, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost, for he was not as yet come upon any of them, but they were only baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then they laid their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost.” Here we have a sacred rite performed by the Apostles themselves, by the imposition of hands, which certainly is not ordination, as some have dreamed; for, as is evident from a previous verse of the same chapter, there were women amongst those upon whom the Apostles imposed their hands. Neither can it be baptism; for the text expressly says, that these Samaritans were previously baptized by St. Philip. Therefore it is that sacrament of Confirmation, which, by the universal testimony of the whole Christian Church, was instituted by Christ, and practised, in this instance, by his Apostles.

Q. Have you any other Scriptural proof showing this sacrament as completely distinct from baptism?

A. Yes; St. Paul first baptized, and then confirmed the Ephesians—Acts 19:5: “Having heard these things, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus; and when Paul had imposed his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came upon them.”

Q. May it not be said, that the Apostles imposed their hands on these occasions to communicate the external and visible gifts of the Holy Ghost, but that bishops have no such power now?

A. The external or visible gifts of the Holy Spirit, such as the gift of tongues or prophecy, were, in the time of the Apostles, necessary for the conversion of the world, as direct proofs that God was the author of their religion; but now that the world has abundant arguments and proofs for that great fundamental truth, miracles are no longer necessary, but the grace of God—communicated along with these miraculous gifts, which strengthened the first Christians unto perfection, and enabled them to lay down, even with joy, their lives rather than deny their faith—has been necessary in every age to all Christians, is still necessary, and will continue so until the end of the world; and it is this

invisible grace of the Holy Ghost which is communicated in Confirmation.

Q. What have you to say to Protestants on this sacrament?

A. You appeal, we say to them, incessantly to Scripture—you boast that you comply with it to the *very letter*—why is it, then, that only a mere handful of you practise this sacred rite? Why do you not, as the Apostles did, impose your hands upon those whom you have baptized?

Q. Are there any proofs for Confirmation in the practice of the ancient and pure Church?

A. Yes; St. Cyril, 3 Cathes., says: "When the body is visibly anointed, the soul becomes sanctified by the interior operation of the Holy Spirit." St. Augustine, Lit. contra Petel. lib. iii. cap. 10, says: "The sacrament of Holy Chrism does not yield in sanctity to baptism itself."

CHAP. III.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What is Confirmation or "the laying on of hands"?

A. It is a rite instituted by the Apostles as a solemn renewal of the vows of baptism, and chiefly useful for persons who have been baptized in infancy and who thus, when they come to years of choice, take these vows upon themselves.

Q. Is it a *sacrament*?

A. Not in the strict sense of the word. There is *not the slightest proof* that it was "instituted by Christ himself." The ceremony is the "laying on of hands" by a bishop upon the head of the person confirmed. You will notice that in the Scripture quoted by the Doctrinal Catechism, there is not a word about "Chrism," or anointing with oil. This practice began some time after the Apostles. The Roman Church retains it, while it has actually *given up* "*the laying on of hands,*" which is what the Apostles did! The Roman bishop only gives a blow on the cheek. Thus it appears further that this is no *sacrament*, (though we

care little about the mere word,) because there is in it, when rightly administered, no "outward and visible sign," that is, no material substance like the *water* in Baptism, or the *bread and wine* in the Eucharist.

Q. What can you say of the argument of the Doctrinal Catechism for the use of this rite among all Christians?

A. It is well enough in the main; but the same has been better said by others.

Q. Is this rite retained in the Protestant Church?

A. Yes, in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and just as it was established by the Apostles.

CHAP. IV.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Is the Holy Eucharist a sacrament?

A. Yes; all parties admit this, even those who look upon it as merely bread and wine.

Q. What is the sensible sign in this sacrament?

A. The appearances of bread and wine which remain after consecration, and under which our blessed Saviour is received into our souls.

Q. What is the inward grace contained in this sacrament?

A. The body and blood of Jesus Christ, the source and author of all grace.

Q. Where do you find Jesus Christ mentioned as the author of this sacrament?

A. In the Gospel account of its institution, Luke 22 : 19, etc., where Jesus Christ, "taking bread, gave thanks, and brake, and gave it to them saying: THIS IS MY BODY; do this for a commemoration of me. In like manner, the chalice also, after he had supped, saying: This is the chalice of the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you."

Q. What does the Catholic Church believe as to this sacrament?

A. That after the words of consecration are pronounced over the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the outward appearances

of the bread and wine—the whole substance of the bread being changed into his body, and the whole substance of the wine into his blood ; we understand also, not his body and blood as they were in this world, but as they are now glorious and immortal in heaven.

Q. What do you mean by a glorious and immortal body ?

A. I mean that kind of body of which St. Paul speaks, 1 Cor. 15 : 44 : “ It is sown a natural body, it shall rise a spiritual body ; if there be a natural body, there is also a spiritual body.”

Q. Do the Greeks hold the same doctrine as the Catholics on this subject ?

A. Yes ; in their attestation, signed by seven Eastern Archbishops, (Perpet. de la Foi., tom. iii. p. 412, etc.,) we read : “ 1st, That the living body of Jesus Christ, who was crucified, who ascended into heaven, and who sits at the right hand of the Father, is TRULY PRESENT in the Eucharist, but in an invisible manner ; 2dly, that the bread and wine, after the invocation of the priest and the consecration, are *substantially changed* into the true body and blood of Jesus Christ, and that the accidents which remain are not bread and wine in reality, although they appear to be bread and wine ; 3dly, that the Eucharist is a sacrifice for the living and the dead, established by Jesus Christ, and which we have from the Apostles by tradition ; 4thly, that the body of Jesus Christ is eaten whole and entire in an impassible state, by those who receive it, whether they be worthy or unworthy ; such as are worthy receive it for their salvation, the unworthy to their condemnation ; that it is also immolated without effusion of blood, and justly adored as God.”

Q. Was not the celebrated Calvinist, Claude, staggered by this Eastern document ?

A. So much so, that he wrote to verify the fact ; and we have the celebrated letter in answer to him, dated May 21, 1672, confirming every word of the above document, in the clearest and strongest language, as containing the faith of the Eastern Church on the subject of the Eucharist. See Perp. de la Foi, already quoted, tom. iii.

Q. What did Luther teach on this subject?

A. "In vain I wished," he says, "to have denied the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, . . . the words of the Scripture are so plain and strong in favor of the mystery, that, spite of all my wishes, although I strained every nerve to reject it, yet I could never bring my mind to adopt the bold expedient." (Ep. Car. Amic.) Again he says: "The denial of the real presence is a piece of downright blasphemy, an impeachment of the Divine veracity;" . . . and he calls the deniers, "a set of deviled, be-deviled, per-deviled, and super-deviled wretches."

Q. What is the real doctrine of even the Church of England on this sacrament?

A. In the Book of Common Prayer, we find the following question: "What is the inward part or thing signified?" (of the Lord's Supper.) The answer is: "The body and blood of Christ, which are *verily* and *indeed* taken, and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

Q. What says Leibnitz? *Systema Theol.*, page 226: Paris, 1819.

A. "But pious antiquity plainly enough declared, that the bread was changed into the body of Christ, the wine into his blood, . . . and this change the Latins have rightly called Transubstantiation, . . . here the Scripture is to be explained by that tradition, which the Church, as its keeper, has transmitted to us."

Q. What says Grotius? *Vot. pro pace.*

A. "I find in all the Liturgies—Greek, Latin, Arabic, Syriac, and others—prayers addressed to God, that, by his Holy Spirit, he would consecrate the gifts offered up, and make them the body of his Son. I was therefore right in asserting, that a practice so ancient and universal, must be considered as having come down from the first ages, *and ought not to have been altered.*"

Q. What says Dr. Parker, Protestant Bishop of Oxford? (*Reasons for Abrogating the Test*, p. 13, anno 1688.)

A. "It is evident to all men that are but ordinarily conversant in ecclesiastical learning, that the ancient

Fathers, from age to age, asserted the real and substantial presence in very high and expressive terms." Indeed, almost all the *learned bishops* of the English Protestant Church are of the same opinion on this matter. And no one can doubt, that a large section of that Church at present are as much Catholic, as the Catholics themselves, on the subject of the Real Presence. (See the Modern Puseyite writers.)

Q. What inference do you draw from this powerful testimony in favor of the real presence?

A. That this portion of Catholic doctrine has the support of every Church deserving the name; that its opponents are few, generally ignorant, and always factious and full of sectarian prejudice. Hence, from the number and learning of the vouchers for the Catholic faith here under discussion, it is manifest, that that faith must be strongly and clearly laid down in Scripture.

CHAP. IV.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What is the other sacrament besides Baptism?

A. The Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion, or Eucharist, (for it is known by each of these names.) *This was* "instituted by Christ himself." The "outward and visible sign" is bread and wine, which are received by the communicant: the inward and spiritual thing signified by this, is such a special favor and presence of our Lord to the soul of a true communicant as is called "His body and blood."

Q. Why is enjoying this favor and presence of our Lord called "receiving his body and blood"?

A. Because, though he can be present to us only *spiritually*, being *bodily* in heaven, yet he has promised to be *thus* present with us, as in these words of the Gospel: "Judas saith unto him, (not Iscariot,) 'Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us and not unto the world?' Jesus answered and said unto him, '*If a man love me, he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and*

*make our abode with him.'** And since we receive this amazing favor from God, and all others, because the body of Christ our dearest Lord hung upon the cross and his blood was poured out there, and especially since *this very sacrament* reminds us of that event, and is our great memorial of it, therefore *most properly* we say that "*the inward part or thing signified in this sacrament is the body and blood of Christ, which are spiritually† taken and received in the Lord's Supper.*" (See the Catechism of the Protestant Episcopal Church.)

Q. Do we in this agree to the superstitious notion that this bread and wine are no longer bread and wine, but are changed into the corporal body and blood of Christ?

A. No; we see that they still remain *bread* and *wine*. They are the *signs* or *sacraments* of the Lord's body and blood. If they were *changed into them* they would not be the *signs* of those things, but the things themselves, and would not *signify* them.

Q. Does this notion of bread and wine becoming actual flesh and blood before our eyes exalt this sacrament?

A. No; it degrades it. It puts a low idea (namely, that we are to perceive our Lord and Saviour by bodily sight, touch, and taste) in place of the true, lofty, and spiritual communion with him *by faith*.

Q. What do you say to the opinions of the Greek Church and of various distinguished men, as quoted by the Doctrinal Catechism?

A. They are of no weight whatever against the plain *word of God* and *facts*.

Q. What "is the real doctrine of the Church of England (and the Protestant Episcopal Church in America) on this sacrament"?

A. It is the XVIIIth Article of Religion, as follows: "Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of

* John 14: 22, 23: "Judas saith to him, not the Iscariot, Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself to us and not to the world? Jesus answered and said to him, If any one love me he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him and will make our abode with him."—Douay Bible.

† The *English* Catechism has "verily and indeed," which we (the American Church) have changed to "*spiritually*;" not because we do not entirely agree to the former words in the sense which the English Church had always intended, but to take away any occasion for cavil, (such as this of the Doctrinal Catechism.) That the two churches agree is plain from the XVIIIth Article of Religion, which is the same with them both.

bread and wine, in the Supper of the Lord, can not be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner."

Q. Is it true that the present doctrine of the Roman Church was held by the first Christians?

A. No; not at all. Within 150 years after the Apostles there began to be some superstitions about this sacrament. Yet the earlier writers use just the same language as the Reformed Churches do now, and even the later ones show by many things which they say, that the Roman doctrine had never yet been thought of. Thus Tertullian (100 years after the Apostles) says: "Our Lord taking the bread and distributing it to his disciples, *made it his body* by saying, This is my body, that is, *THE FIGURE OF MY BODY.*"* So also 200 years later (St.) Augustine says: "If the sacraments had not a certain likeness to those things of which they are the sacraments, they could not be sacraments at all. But from this likeness they take for the most part the names of the things themselves. Therefore, *in a certain sense*, the *sacrament* of Christ's body is *the body of Christ*, and the *sacrament* of Christ's blood is *the blood of Christ*," etc.†

Q. Is it true that "almost all the learned Bishops of the English Protestant Church" believe in the Roman doctrine about this?

A. There is no truth in it whatever. The party in the English and American churches which avows some such belief, is insignificant. The "Bishop Parker" quoted lived 170 years ago, and was a partisan of King James II.‡

* Adv. Marc. iv. 457.

† Ep. 98, ad. Bonif. Op. ii. 400.

‡ This king belonged to the Roman Church, and was trying to bring all the English into it.

CHAP. V.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Did Christ make any particular promise, as regards the Eucharist, before he instituted it?

A. Yes; a very clear promise, in the sixth chapter of St. John.

Q. Does this chapter regard the Eucharist?

A. Yes; even the learned Mr. Johnson, a Protestant, in his "Unbloody Sacrifice," shows, at large, that the Primitive Fathers understood the sixth chapter of St. John as referring to the Eucharist.

Q. Is there any thing remarkable in the first part of this chapter?

A. Yes; the astonishing miracle which Christ performed in feeding five thousand persons with only five loaves and two fishes, is here related; and such a miracle was truly a suitable prelude to the introduction of that miracle of miracles—the Holy Eucharist, by which he was, with heavenly bread—that is, with his own body and blood—to feed all his faithful followers. The very fact that he wrought this astonishing miracle, before introducing the subject of the Eucharist, shows that he was about to speak on a matter that required strong faith in his followers and audience. If he had merely to announce to them that he was going to give them common bread and wine, is it likely he would have introduced it by such a tremendous miracle?

Q. Does it appear that the Jews had, before the teaching of Christ, any notion that the Messiah would give them bread from heaven, as Moses had done?

A. Yes; for in one of their earliest works after the coming of Christ, "Commentary on the Book of Ecclesiastes," they say, that as Moses brought down manna from heaven, so one of the signs of the Messiah should be, that he should bring down bread from heaven. Various Jewish teachers in the early ages of Christianity, according to R. David Kimchi, seem to have admitted transubstantiation, grounding it on that passage of Osee, chap. 14 : 8 : "And they shall live upon wheat, and they shall blossom as a vine; his

memorial shall be as the vine of Lebanon.” “Many Doctors,” says David Kimchi, “expound this text, that there shall be made *a CHANGE OF NATURE IN WHEAT* in the times of our Redeemer Christ.”

Q. Does Christ himself appear to allude to this belief of the Jews?

A. Yes, in very clear terms; John, chap. 6 : 32 : “Amen, amen, I say to you, Moses gave you not bread from heaven ; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven.”

Q. What does Christ say that this bread from heaven is?

A. In verse 35, he says, it is *himself*; I AM THE BREAD OF LIFE.”

Q. What follows these astonishing words?

A. A long and impressive instruction as to the necessity of believing his words, which shows clearly, that he was about to reveal something which he knew his audience would have great difficulty in believing.

Q. After ending the instruction as to faith, with these impressive words, “Amen, amen, I say to you, he that believeth in me hath everlasting life,” how does he proceed?

A. He repeats again, verse 48, the awful words, “I am the bread of life,” as if he saw they would now be believed, in consequence of the instruction he had given.

Q. Does he show, that the bread which he will give, shall be better than the miraculous manna, and, consequently, better than the bread and wine of the Protestant sacrament?

A. Yes: he says: “Your fathers did *eat manna* in the desert, and *are dead*; this is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that if *any man eat of it*, he may *not die*.”

CHAP. V.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What shall we say of our Lord's words in the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel?

A. Even some high authorities in the Roman Church doubt of their meaning this sacrament.* But in any

* Fath. Paul ii. 253.

case it is a low and gross notion which supposes them to mean that a man can not be saved unless he actually swallows the flesh of our Redeemer. They mean that we must feed upon him in the sense of *believing* in him, (especially in his dying for us,) and *being his* in heart. The Gospel of salvation which he proclaims, will thus be food for our souls to everlasting life.

Q. *Did this discourse follow immediately after the miracle of feeding the five thousand with five loaves; so that it can be said that "he introduced it by such a tremendous miracle"?*

A. No. The Lord went away from the people immediately after this miracle. It was they who looked for him and found him out *the next day*, when this discourse was uttered. Plainly this miracle was performed, like all the others, only out of pity for the hungry people, and to convince them that he was "the Son of God, the Saviour of the world." Of this there are four other plain proofs: 1st, *It is not said* in the Gospels that this miracle was to introduce the subject of the Eucharist. 2d. While all four evangelists relate the miracle, *only one* gives the discourse. 3d. He performed *several other great miracles* between that one and the discourse, as, walking on the sea, (Matt. 14 : 24-33, etc.,) and healing sick persons, (ib. 35, 36.) 4th, He afterwards performed just such a miracle (Matt. 15 : 32-38,) feeding four thousand with seven loaves, but no such discourse followed that.

Q. It is plain then that the miracle, however "astonishing" and "tremendous," had nothing special to do with these words: we must judge then of the words from themselves. What are they *in full*, that the sense may not be unfairly given by leaving out any thing?

A. First these: "Verily, verily I say unto you, Ye seek me not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled. Labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you; for him hath God the Father sealed. Then said they unto him, What shall we do that we might work the works of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that *ye believe* on him whom he hath sent. They said therefore unto him, What sign showest thou then, that we may see

and believe thee? what dost thou work? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert, as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat. Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, *Moses* gave you not that bread from heaven, but *my Father* giveth you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven and giveth life unto the world. Then said they unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread.”*

Q. Did the Lord then reply that this bread of life was the eating his actual flesh in the sacrament?

A. No; He said that this *eating* must be *believing in Him as a Saviour*, just as it is said in Isaiah 55 : 1, “Come buy and eat,” etc.† So here: “And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that *cometh to me* shall never hunger, and he that BELIEVETH ON ME shall never thirst. But I said unto you that ye have also seen me and believe not. All that the Father giveth me shall come to me, and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out. For I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. And this is the Father’s will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one who seeth the Son and believeth on him may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day.”‡

* John 6 : 26-34: “Amen, amen, I say to you, you seek me not because you have seen miracles, but because you did eat of the loaves and were filled. Labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man will give you. For him hath God the Father sealed. They said therefore to him, What shall we do that we may work the works of God? Jesus answered and said to them, This is the work of God, that you believe in him whom he hath sent. They said therefore to him, What sign then dost thou show, that we may see and may believe thee? what dost thou work? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert: as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat. Then said Jesus to them, Amen, amen, I say to you, Moses gave you not bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is that which cometh down from heaven and giveth life to the world. Then they said to him, Lord, give us always this bread.”—Douay Bible.

† So the Douay Bible.

‡ 35-40: “And Jesus said to them, I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall not hunger: and he that believeth in me shall never

Q. What was it then in these words which displeased the unbelieving Jews?

A. Not his saying that they must eat him, but his claiming to have come from heaven. "The Jews then murmured at him because he said, I am the bread *which came down from heaven*. And they said, Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? *how is it then that he said, I came down from heaven?* Jesus therefore answered and said unto them, Murmur not among yourselves. No man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him, and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, And they shall all be taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard and hath learned of the Father cometh unto me. Not that any man hath seen the Father save he which is of God; he hath seen the Father. Verily, verily, I say unto you, HE THAT BELIEVETH ON ME hath everlasting life. *I am that bread of life*. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. *I am the living bread which came down from heaven*; if any man eat of this bread he shall live forever. And the bread which I will give is my flesh which I will give for the life of the world."*

thirst. But I said to you that you also have seen me, and you believe not. All that the Father giveth me shall come to me, and him that cometh to me I will not cast out; because I came down from heaven not to do my own will but the will of him that sent me. Now this is the will of him that sent me, the Father, that all that he hath given me I lose not thereof, but raise it up again the last day. And this is the will of my Father who sent me, that every one who seeth the Son and believeth in him may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day."

* 41-52: "The Jews then murmured at him because he had said: I am the living bread which came down from heaven. And they said: Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How then saith he, I came down from heaven? Jesus therefore answered and said to them: Murmur not among yourselves. No man can come to me except the Father who hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets: And they shall all be taught of God. Every one that hath heard of the Father and hath learned cometh to me. Not that any man hath seen the Father, but he who is of God, he hath seen the Father. Amen, amen, I say unto you, He that believeth in me hath everlasting life. I am the bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the desert, and they died.

Q. Do those words then, "I am the bread of life," seem to you "awful words," as the Doctrinal Catechism has it?

A. No, but *blessed* words; because they show with so much plainness how I may eat of the bread of eternal life by *believing on our Lord Jesus Christ* who gave his flesh upon the cross for the life of the world. This indeed is better bread than the manna of the Israelites or any bread and wine; and I would pray with all my heart: "Lord, evermore give me this bread."

CHAP. VI.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. After having prepared the minds of his audience by feeding five thousand persons with five loaves, and lectured them on the necessity of strong and lively faith—after having repeated, again, that he himself was the bread of life from heaven—what does he now say that this bread is in reality?

A. Verse 52, he says: "The bread that I will give is *my flesh*, for the life of the world."

Q. How did the Jews receive this announcement?

A. Verse 53: "They strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" This is exactly the question put, at the present day, by unbelieving Protestants, "How?!!" To put such a question to the Almighty, is it not blasphemy? *How* did he create the world out of nothing? *How* did he turn the rod of Moses into a serpent? *How* did he change the waters into blood? *How* the water into wine at Cana? *How* feed five thousand people with five loaves?

Q. If he had meant, that what he was to give them was *mere* bread and *mere* wine, what should he, as a *good* and *wise* God, have done, now that he saw the Jews would not believe him?

A. He should at once have explained, (as he did on other occasions,) that he did not wish to be understood

This is the bread descending down from heaven; that if any one eat of it he may not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever, and the bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world."—Douay Bible.

literally, but figuratively—that he meant to give them bread and wine as a commemoration of his death.

Q. Did he give such an explanation?

A. No; he repeats, verse 54, the same again in stronger language, and even with an asseveration: “Then Jesus said to them, Amen, amen, I say unto you, except you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you;” and, in the next five verses, in order to give strength to his words, and to leave no doubt of his meaning on the mind of any one, he, in different forms, but almost in the same words, repeats over and over the same truth without any explanation whatever.

Q. When, on other occasions, Christ taught any thing in figurative language, was he in the habit of giving an explanation immediately after, lest his words might be misunderstood, and lest the people might be misled by his figurative language, by interpreting his words literally?

A. Most certainly he was. In John, chap. 3, he corrects Nicodemus, who understood him literally, when he wished to be understood figuratively. In Matt. chap. 16 : 5, he corrects the Apostles, who understood him literally, when he meant to speak figuratively, on the *Leaven of the Pharisees*. In John, chap. 4 : 32, his disciples misunderstood him as to the *food* he spoke of, taking him in the literal sense; he instantly corrects the error by explaining himself. In John, chap. 11 : 11, his disciples again mistake him, and he instantly explains. In Matt. chap. 19, there is another misunderstanding on the part of his disciples, and he at once sets them right. Another instance may be seen in Matt. chap. 8.

Q. Did the Jews, the Apostles, and the disciples of Jesus, understand him here in the literal sense?

A. Yes; for the *Jews ask, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?* Verse 62 : “*His disciples murmured.*” Verse 67 : “*After this, many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him;*” whilst he finds it necessary, in verse 68, to ask his Apostles, “*Will you also go?*”

Q. Seeing, then, that all are about to leave him—that they are scandalized at his doctrine—that they do not believe him in the literal sense, does he, on this, as on every other occasion, explain himself at

once, and show them, that he speaks in figures, that he does not intend to give them his flesh and his blood in reality, but merely bread and wine, as a commemoration of himself?

A. No; he sees that the Jews, the disciples, and the twelve Apostles, understand him in the very sense which he intended. He allows them to go away, he gives no explanation, because he has none to give. They understand him literally, and he speaks literally. He appeals to his Ascension, as an argument which should induce them to believe, (verse 63.) In verse 64, he clearly tells them, that the eating of dead flesh will profit them nothing, but that the flesh which he will give them is his glorified body, animated by his soul and his life-giving divinity—that same body, soul, and divinity by which, in the mystery of Redemption, he was to give life to the world. He exhorts them again to have faith, showing that he was teaching something which it was difficult to believe; and concludes, by asking his Apostles, whether they also refuse to believe him: To which St. Peter replies, (verse 69,) with full confidence in his divine Master: “Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life, . . . thou art Christ the Son of God.”

Q. What general inference would you draw from the conduct of those to whom Christ addressed himself on this occasion?

A. If Christ intended only to give bread and wine, as a memorial of himself, why did he not say so to prevent the departure of his followers, and to teach them truth? Or can any one in his senses suppose, that the Author of truth would leave in doubt and obscurity one of the most important articles of the religion he was about to establish? Assuredly no. Then he spoke in the literal sense—then he wished to be understood in the literal sense—then the Jews, the disciples, and the Apostles understood him correctly. The Jews and disciples left him, because they would not believe that he could give them his flesh and blood. But the Apostles, who knew that he was God, to whom nothing was impossible, who could not be deceived himself, and could not deceive them, submitted to the belief of the incomprehensible mystery, in these words, “Lord, to

whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life;" we believe all that thou hast taught, *no matter how difficult*, BECAUSE "we have *believed* and have *known*, THAT THOU ART THE CHRIST THE SON OF GOD."

Q. If Christ intended to be understood in the figurative sense, and meant only to give bread and wine, would there have been any reason why all his audience should have turned their backs upon him?

A. Certainly not; since such memorial would have been inferior both to the manna and Paschal Lamb of the Old Law.

Q. If Christ intended only mere bread and wine, was it not an awful violation of the propriety of language to say, that, in using these, his followers would be *eating his flesh and drinking his blood*?

A. Yes, most certainly; such as we can never suppose the wisdom of God could adopt; nay more, such language was well calculated to deter the Jews from believing his doctrine at all, because, in their language, to *eat the flesh* of any one, meant to do him some grievous injury, (see 27th Psalm; 19th chapter of Job; Ecclesiastes, chap. 4; St. James, chap. 5.) As to the drinking of blood, it was universally considered a dreadful crime among the Jews. (See Gen. chap. 9; Levit. chap. 7; Sam. chap. 14; Judith, chap. 11.) And as to the eating of human flesh, or drinking human blood, it is mentioned as the most dreadful curse God could inflict on mankind. (See Wisd. 11:7; Apoc. 16:6; Jerem. 19:8.)

Q. What would you draw from this consideration?

A. That Christ evidently wished to be understood in the literal sense, and on account of this, was compelled to use language disagreeable to Jewish ears; otherwise, his use of such expressions was uncalled for, improper, and unwise, and calculated to defeat the very object which our divine Saviour had in view: and this supposition, that the very *Author of wisdom* would couch the doctrines he wished the entire world to believe, in language unpardonably incorrect and scandalous to his followers, is not only absurd—it is impious and blasphemous.

CHAP. VI.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. When our Lord Christ said, "The bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world," what did he plainly mean?

A. He foretold that he was about to die to take away the sins of the world, and that his people would "feed upon him in their hearts by faith" by trusting in this his cross, and passion, and precious death.

Q. The Doctrinal Catechism says that if he had thus spoken *figuratively*, he would have so explained it, especially when he saw the Jews scandalized at the literal meaning of his words. *Did he not so explain himself?*

A. YES, HE DID. Here is the whole passage, that you may judge for yourself. "The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How shall this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, *except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day.* For my flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink indeed. *He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me and I in him.* As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. *This is that bread which came down from heaven:* not as your fathers did eat manna and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live forever. These things said he in the synagogue as he taught in Capernaum. Many, therefore, of his disciples when they had heard this, said, This is a hard saying; who can hear it? *When Jesus knew in himself that his disciples murmured at it, he said unto them, Doth this offend you? WHAT AND IF YE SHALL SEE THE SON OF MAN ASCEND UP WHERE HE WAS BEFORE? It is the Spirit that quickeneth, THE FLESH PROFITETH NOTHING:* the WORDS THAT I SPEAK UNTO YOU, they are spirit and they are life."*

* 53-64: "The Jews therefore debated among themselves, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said to them,

Q. How does (St.) Augustine give the plain meaning of these last words?

A. "Some of his disciples were greatly stumbled at this and said, 'This is a hard saying.' They were hard, and not the saying. For if they had not been hard but meek, they would have said to themselves, He does not say this without a cause, and there is some sacrament concealed in these words. They would have remained with him, not hard but soft of heart, and would have learned from him what they who remained learned. But he instructed these last and said to them, 'It is the Spirit,' etc. *Understand in a spiritual way what I have said. YOU ARE NOT GOING TO CHEW THIS BODY WHICH YOU SEE, AND DRINK THAT BLOOD WHICH THEY WHO SHALL CRUCIFY ME WILL SHED. I have shown you a certain sacrament. If you understand it in a spiritual manner it will give you life. For though it must of necessity be celebrated visibly, it must be understood INVISIBLY.*"*—"What does he mean by the question, 'Doth this offend you?' '*Do you think that I am about to divide THE BODY WHICH YOU BEHOLD and cut my members into pieces and give them to you?*' 'What, therefore, and if you shall see the Son of man ascending,' etc.? *Certainly he who could ascend entire COULD NOT BE CONSUMED.*"† Thus our Lord mentioned his future ascension into heaven as a proof that he could not mean the eating of his ACTUAL BODY as the bread of life, but BELIEVING IN HIM.

Amen, amen, I say unto you; Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me the same also shall live by me. This is the bread that came down from heaven. Not as your fathers did eat manna and died. He that eateth this bread shall live forever. These things he said teaching in the synagogue in Caphernaum. Many, therefore of his disciples hearing it said: This saying is hard and who can hear it? But Jesus knowing in himself that his disciples murmured at this, said to them: Doth this scandalize you? If then you shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? It is the spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life."—Douay Bible.

* Op. vi. 1265.—In Ps. 93.

† Op. v. 446.

Q. What other things do you observe in these words, which show that he could not have meant the doctrine of the Roman Church?

A. 1st, According to this doctrine then, no one can be saved without partaking of the Holy Communion; 2d, No one who ever did partake of it can be lost; 3d, As they must "drink the blood" as well as "eat the flesh," none but priests can be saved; 4th, The Lord "dwells in" every such one, and he in the Lord, however wicked he may be; and 5th, Christ's *flesh* must have come down from heaven when he came into the world to save sinners; for "this bread is *that which came down from heaven.*"

Q. Did the first Christians understand these words in that way?

A. *There is not a trace of such a notion in their writings.* On the contrary *Tertullian* says: "He declares the same *discourse* to be also his *flesh*, for his discourse was made his flesh, and for that reason is to be sought and *eaten by hearing, and chewed by the understanding, and digested by faith.*"* *Eusebius*: "By these words he designed to teach them that what they had heard of his *flesh and blood* was to be understood in a *spiritual sense* as if he had said, 'Do not think that I am speaking of the *flesh with which I am surrounded,* AS IF YOU OUGHT TO EAT THAT, nor imagine that you are to DRINK OF MY SENSIBLE AND CORPORAL BLOOD, but you must clearly understand that the words which I speak unto you are spirit and life. So that *his words and discourses* are flesh and blood, and if a man *eat of them* as feeding on celestial food, *he shall be a partaker of life eternal.*"† So also (Sts.) *Athanasius* and *Augustine* as above. Indeed, this last and truly great Father expresses himself in a way from which there is *no escape* in these words: "If a preceptive speech either forbids a crime or a sin, or orders something useful or beneficent, it is not figurative. But if it appears to order a crime or a sin, it is figurative. 'Unless you eat,' saith our Lord, 'the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.' Here he seems to order a crime or an outrage, and therefore IT IS A FIGURE di-

* De Resur. c. 37.

† Ecc. Theol. iii. c. 12.

*recting the communion of our Lord's passion and that we should sweetly and usefully LAY UP IN OUR MEMORY that for us his flesh was crucified and wounded."**

Q. Does this figurative language mean "mere bread and wine"?

A. We do not say so. With (St.) Augustine we understand it to mean the great death of our Lord upon the cross, in which we believe, and which is indeed *represented to us* in this blessed sacrament by the elements of bread and wine. It does not seem strange that then many murmured and went back and walked no more with the Lord, when so many even now refuse to humble themselves to receive this same free mercy of God.

Q. What must you say of the calling this figurative language of our Lord "an awful violation of the propriety of language," and "improper, unwise," etc.?

A. Since it is plain that he did speak in this figurative way, I wonder at and pity those who, to fix another meaning upon his words, can say such things of what was done by the most blessed Lord of Christians.

CHAP. VII.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Christ then promised, that he would give his body and blood for the spiritual food of his people—where do you find that promise fulfilled?

A. In Luke 22 : 19 : "And taking bread, he gave thanks, and brake, and gave to them, saying: '*This is my body which is given for you.*'" Place these words beside the words of the promise, and you will at once admit the promise fulfilled. The words of the promise were: "And the bread that I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world."

Q. Is the institution as to the cup or chalice equally clear?

A. Yes; the words of the promise were: "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and *drink his blood*, you shall not have life in you." This promise is now

* De Doct. Christ. iii.—Op. iii. 40.

fulfilled in these words, Luke 22 : 20 : "This is the chalice of the New Testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you."

Q. Are the Evangelists, Matthew (26 : 26, 28) and Mark (14 : 22, 24) equally clear ?

A. Yes ; and the fact, that they repeat the words of the institution almost in the very same words, and essentially in the very same sense—that they all repeat the words *body* and *blood* with the most remarkable uniformity of language, is one of the strongest proofs for the real presence.

Q. Why so ?

A. Because they, at least, knew what Christ meant by the words *body* and *blood* ; and if Christ meant by these merely *bread* and *wine*, some of them, were it only by accident, would have given his meaning instead of his words, or at all events, would have given some explanation of them ; yet not one of them did so.

Q. Is there any thing remarkable in the *Syriac* version of St. Mark ?

A. Yes ; learned Catholics, as well as Protestants, admit, that it represents our Lord as saying, "*Take, eat, this is my body ITSELF*;" thus clearly confirming the Catholic interpretation. (See Walton, Prol. Bib. Polygl.)

Q. If Christ intended to deliver to mankind his *real body and blood*, could he have used more proper, concise, or correct language ?

A. No ; we can not conceive language better chosen.

Q. If he intended mere bread and wine, could he have used more improper language ?

A. No ; in that case, the use of such language would be unwise and inexplicable.

Q. Was the time in which Christ instituted the sacrament a period of his mortal career, in which the use of the most obscure and improper figures should be employed to convey to his Apostles (those who were to teach the world) the most simple and necessary truths ?

A. Certainly not ; he was making his *last Testament*, which, even amongst men, is made in as simple and clear language as possible ; he was teaching his Apostles what they were to teach others ; he was teaching

what was to be believed and practised by the whole world till the latest ages, and upon the belief and practice of which all were to be saved or damned. The awfulness of the time, therefore, the awful nature of the doctrine, and its awful importance to those who were to teach, as well as to those who should be taught, all demanded from a good and wise God, what he could easily give, and what he most assuredly did give—the utmost perspicuity in the language used.

Q. Is there any thing remarkable in the words of the old alliance, which tends to illustrate these words of the new, "This is my blood"?

A. Yes; in Exodus, chap. 24, Moses took blood and sprinkled it upon the people, saying: "*This is the blood of the covenant* which the Lord hath made with you." The words of Christ in the New Testament have evidently a relation to those of Moses in the Old; and as Moses presented to the people, in the Old Law, the *real blood* of the victims, so, in the New the *real blood* of the heavenly victim—the Lamb of God—is presented to the children of the new covenant.

Q. If, in this most dignified of all the sacraments, the true body and blood of Christ were not present, what would be the consequence?

A. That Jesus Christ, the *all-wise God and Saviour* of mankind, did intentionally, or at least indifferent as to the awful consequences, express himself so in its institution, as to deceive nineteen twentieths of those he came to *redeem*—to involve all Christians in bitter and endless disputes, and expose the great body of his Church to be guilty of the appalling crime of idolatry—all this, too, whilst one word of explanation from him would have prevented all these evils.

Q. What would you infer from this?

A. That, as these blasphemous suppositions can not for a moment be entertained, so it is clear, beyond all doubt, that Christ spoke in the literal sense—in that he intended to be understood, and in that sense, and no other, his language is perfectly intelligible.

Q. Was the Almighty pleased to be explicit in the language which he employed in the establishment of other institutions of importance?

A. To be satisfied that he was so in institutions of much less importance, read Gen. 17 : 10, on circumcision ; Exod. 12 : 3, on the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb ; and Leviticus, on general ritual observance : and in the New Law, the sacrament of baptism is instituted and enforced, in language the most clear and precise.

Q. If Christ meant to leave us in the sacrament mere bread and wine, are not his words sufficiently explicit ?

A. No ; they are the reverse. He says, "*This is my body, this is my blood ;*" whilst Protestants would make him mean by these words—This is NOT my body, this is NOT my blood.

CHAP. VII.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Do they believe more in the very words of our Redeemer Jesus Christ than we do, who say, that by "*This is my body,*" etc., he meant that the bread which he held in his hand was his own actual flesh ?

A. No ; for they plainly make him say what he never meant.

Q. What was his natural and evident meaning in all these words ?

A. This : "To-morrow I am to die a bloody and painful death to redeem you, and all the souls of men. I therefore appoint in the Church, which is the society of those who believe on and are saved by me this ceremony, to be always observed in memorial of my death. As in Baptism you are to use water to represent the washing away of sin, so in this sacrament you shall use two very simple substances to represent to your eyes what is commemorated. Bread shall be the sign of my body, as it will then have been broken for you. Wine shall be the symbol of my blood shed in this death. Thus," (taking bread and blessing it,) "Take, eat, this is my body. Do this in remembrance of me ;" (and afterwards handing to them a cup of wine,) "This is my blood of the new covenant ; drink ye all of it."

Q. Can you suppose that if you had been present, you would have understood his words in any other way?

A. Not for a moment. No, I can not for a moment suppose that any one seeing him sitting there, holding the bread and wine in his own hands, would doubt what he really meant more than when he said, "I am the true vine."^{*}

Q. What does he himself call the wine, *after giving them the cup*?

A. Not *his blood*, but "THIS FRUIT OF THE VINE."[†]

Q. Can you suppose that our Lord Christ would then have feared that the Apostles might think he meant his actual flesh and blood?

A. It is incredible.

Q. What did their senses tell them, as yours do you, about the bread and wine of the Eucharist?

A. That they remained bread and wine after consecration, the same as before. So our Lord knew that the Apostles would not mistake his words when he said, "This is my body," etc., but would know that he meant, "This is the memorial, or sign, of my body." On the other hand, if he meant that it was actually *changed into* his body, knowing that they would not be likely to take his words that way, he would have said, Do not take these words as a figure, but literally.

Q. Did our Lord and Saviour then "so express himself in the institution of this Sacrament as to deceive nineteen twentieths of those he came to redeem," etc., into the idea of his corporal flesh and blood being seen in the Lord's Supper?

A. No: not a soul ever thought of such a thing for many hundred years after. Ignatius calls the "eucharist, the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ," etc.; but he elsewhere calls it *bread*.[‡] The like is true of other early writers; and they plainly mean that it is our Lord's body in the figurative sense in which he himself spoke, and as *we* also term it.

Q. Do many of them, on the other hand, so express themselves as to make it *certain* that they never imagined it to be actual flesh and blood?

A. Yes, as in some passages already quoted, (p. 243,) and others such as these: (St.) *Ambrose*: "Listen to

^{*} John 15 : 1. So the Douay Bible.

[†] Matt. 26 : 29. So the Douay Bible.

[‡] Ep. ad Eph. xx.

the celestial words of consecration. The priest says, 'Make this to us, O Lord, a chosen, allowed, reasonable, and acceptable sacrifice, which is THE FIGURE of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.'"* *Theodoret*: "He who called the natural body *corn* and *bread*, and who again and again named himself *the vine*—he honored visible symbols with the title of *his body and blood*—NOT CHANGING THEIR NATURE, but adding grace to nature."† (*Pope*) *Gelasius*: "THE SUBSTANCE OF BREAD AND WINE DOES NOT CEASE TO EXIST, and plainly the IMAGE AND LIKENESS of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in the performance of the mysteries."‡

Q. How then did men come to put upon the words of our Lord the gross and monstrous meaning of his taking his actual flesh and blood and giving them to the Apostles to eat and drink; and what is, if possible, even worse, that all priests could thus create and use the flesh and blood of the King of kings and Lord of lords?

A. This notion was never fully declared until the deepest darkness of the Dark Ages, after prayers to saints, image-worship, Purgatory, and the power of the Popes were set up. However, the way had been prepared for it by the superstitious veneration for the sacraments which already prevailed, and the strong figurative language about them which many writers had used. Yet, when this notion of a magical change by a priest, of bread and wine into a God that was to be adored, was first directly stated by one *Paschase*, seven hundred years after the Apostles, it was rejected with horror by the more learned men of the Church. It fell in, however, with the superstition of the multitude, and tended to increase the influence of the priesthood. So, in those sad times it soon prevailed. Yet the word "Transubstantiation," to describe it, was not invented until two or three hundred years later.

* Op. ii. 371. Nothing can be more decisive than this, *the very form of words* used in celebrating this sacrament in those days.

† Eran. Dial. i. p. 26.

‡ Bib. Max. Pat. (Despont.) vii. 703.

CHAP. VIII.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Can you quote any other Scriptural authority on the subject?

A. Yes; several, and of great importance. St. Paul, 1 Cor. 10 : 16, says : “The chalice of *benediction* which we bless, is it not the *communion of the blood of Christ*? and the bread which we break, is it not the *partaking of the body of the Lord*? ”

Q. What is the first remark you would make on this passage?

A. St. Paul knew well whether the sacrament was the body and blood of Christ, or only mere bread and wine. He is here preaching to the Christian Corinthians, instructing them in what they ought to believe and practise. If, then, Christ spoke figuratively, why does not St. Paul now explain these figures to the simple and the unlettered? Why does he now, when he ought to be plain and clear, call bread, *the body*, and wine, *the blood* of Christ? If the Protestant be the true sense of these words, why does he not, *even by accident*, hint at such a meaning?

Q. Have you any other reflection to offer on St. Paul's words?

A. If the cup contain *only wine*, how can St. Paul call it a cup of *benediction* or *blessing*? If only wine, how can the reception of it be the *communion of the BLOOD OF CHRIST*? If what appears bread, be *only bread*, how can the partaking of it be the partaking of the *body of the Lord*? Besides, the word which St. Paul uses to express communion, is *koinonia*, not *metoche*, a word which expresses, not any ordinary union, but the closest union of what we receive with our own substance.

Q. What does St. Paul say in the next verse? (1 Cor. 10 : 17.)

A. After having said, that we are partakers of the body and blood of Christ, under the forms of bread and wine, he now adds : “For we, being many, are one bread, one body, all that partake of one bread.” Now, in the Catholic sense of the sacrament, these words are true strictly, for we all partake of ONE AND THE SAME

BREAD—that is, the sacred flesh of the Lord. The *bread* which I will give, is my *flesh*; but, in the Protestant sense, St. Paul's words would be nonsense; for if the sacrament be mere bread, then each receiver partakes of a different bread; and hence, as the bread upon which they feed is not one, so neither can they be cemented into one body. Protestants, therefore, being neither *one bread*, nor *one body*, are not the sort of Christians to whom St. Paul addressed himself.

Q. What does St. Paul say in the next verse (18) of same chapter?

A. "Are not they that eat of the sacrifice, partakers of the altar?"

Q. What does St. Paul mean by these words?

A. That as the Jews, by the order of the Almighty, always, except when precluded by their sins, eat of the victims that were offered, so also the Christians, by partaking of the altar, eat of the sacrifice; but the Christian sacrifice is Christ himself; therefore, in partaking of the victim, they eat the body and drink the blood of Christ.

Q. Have you any other Scriptural argument?

A. On this all-important matter, the arguments from Scripture seem inexhaustible. St. Paul, 1 Cor. 11: 23, 24, and 25, records the institution in the very language adopted by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and adds, that he has learned what he writes from *the Lord*. Now, if Christ had spoken in figures at the institution, would it not be natural to expect, that, in this new revelation to St. Paul, who was not present at the Last Supper, he should vary the language so as to afford some explanation of these figures? And yet he does not; the same words are adhered to with the most wonderful exactness. Again, St. Paul knew the true meaning of these words; and if he understood them to mean mere bread and wine, used as a figure or commemoration, why did he not, writing, as he was, in *Greek*, to the Corinthians, say—this is a *figure of my body*, or a commemoration of my blood; or this *SIGNIFIES my body and my blood*? St. Paul was instructing the ignorant—he tells these ignorant people, that what they believed

to be bread and wine, is the body and blood of Christ; was this the way an inspired Apostle should instruct the simple?—would any Protestant minister imitate St. Paul in this odd system of instruction?

Q. Does St. Paul give any explanation, which proves incontestably, that he understood the sacrament to be the true body and blood of Christ?

A. Yes; in verse 27th of same chapter, he says: "Therefore, whosoever shall *eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord.*"

Q. What inferences do you draw from these words?

A. That St. Paul believed in the real presence; for how could he call the chalice, *the chalice of the Lord*, if it were only a cup containing *common wine*? And what would the unworthiness consist in, if only common bread and wine were present, and how could the unworthy receiver be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, if the body and blood of the Lord were not there present?

Q. What do you remark on the following verse, (28,) "But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of the chalice"?

A. That, in the sacrament, there must be something more than mere bread; otherwise, why this searching proof and trial before receiving it?

Q. What are the concluding words of St. Paul, verse 29?

A. "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself; not discerning the body of the Lord."

Q. What do you say on these words?

A. How could a man become unworthy by eating a morsel of bread and drinking a little wine, as a commemoration of the death of Christ? Why, above all, is he consigned to eternal damnation for a thing, in itself, so indifferent—and why is he doomed to this awful fate, for not discerning the body of the Lord, if the body of the Lord be not there, since, if not there, it can not be insulted or profaned? If the Catholic be the true doctrine—if the body and blood of Christ are

truly and really present—then are all St. Paul's words intelligible and full of meaning ; but, in the Protestant sense, they are the most unintelligible gibberish that ever was uttered.

Q. Can you draw any further proof of this from the next verse, (30,) "Therefore, are there many infirm and weak among you, and many sleep"?

A. Yes, and a very strong proof. St. Paul, in these words, says : on account of your unworthy communions, because you, in many instances, receive, without discerning the body of the Lord, you are afflicted with sickness, and even with death, in punishment of your awful guilt by the profanation of the sacred body and blood of the Redeemer—a punishment which we can not suppose inflicted for eating bread or drinking mere wine.

Q. Are the Christian Church and dispensation superior to those of the Old Law ?

A. Certainly ; this is admitted on all hands, by Protestants as well as Catholics.

Q. Would this be the case, if the most dignified sacrament of the New Law were only bread and wine, used as a mere figure of the Christian sacrifice ?

A. Assuredly not ; for how much more dignified, and strikingly illustrative of the sufferings and death of our beloved Saviour, was the Paschal Lamb of the Jews, slain and offered up before the Lord, than is the unmeaning practice of eating and drinking bread and wine, as the only memorial of the Christian Pasch.

Q. Was the manna of the desert a figure of the Christian sacrament of the Eucharist ?

A. Yes ; Christ himself declares it ; but if the Protestant bread and wine be the Christian Pasch, then the figure is greater than the reality, and Christianity is degraded even below the level of the Judaic rite. The manna was miraculous bread, the Protestant sacrament is natural bread ; the manna came from on high, the Protestant sacrament came from the earth, or the baker's oven ; the manna was a heavenly food, given only to the people of God, the Protestant sacrament is the common food of all men, wicked and virtuous,

Jews and Gentiles, Turks and Christians; the manna, on the Sabbath, suffered not corruption, the Protestant sacrament is corruptible at all times, it has no miraculous qualities; the manna had the taste of all kinds of food, and yet was not of all these foods, the Protestant sacrament has the taste of ordinary bread, and has no heavenly property whatever. Thus, according to the Protestant faith, Christianity sinks into insignificance before the wonders of Judaism—the figure is greater than the reality—Moses superior to Christ—all our notions of religion are subverted—we find ourselves entangled in a dreadful mass of absurdities and contradiction. But when we look at the Catholic Pasch, and believe in the illustrious sacrifice and sacrament in which the body and blood of Jesus Christ are offered and received, we are extricated from our inexplicable difficulties; our understanding becomes unclouded; we perceive at once the noble and significant figure of the Old, and the infinitely superior and illustrious reality of the New Law.

CHAP. VIII.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Is there any thing in the other books of the New Testament to justify this idea of literal flesh and blood?

A. *Nothing whatever.* The only other account indeed which we have of this sacrament is in St. Paul's 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, the tenth and eleventh chapters.

Q. Give *all of this*, and let us see if *he* tells, as the Roman Church does, of any "tremendous sacrifice of the Mass," in which there is no bread and wine left, though there seems to be, but "Christ whole and entire—the *divinity** and humanity whole and entire, the *soul*, the body and blood of Christ, with all their component parts; the whole substance of the bread being changed into his body, and the whole substance of the wine into his blood"? (Cat. of the Council of Trent.)

A. Here is what is said first: "Wherefore, my

* Turn back to p. 126, and you will see the Doctrinal Catechism *suppressing* a part of this, and speaking only of his *humanity* "on the altar."

dearly beloved, flee from idolatry. I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say. The *cup of blessing* which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The *bread* which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For *we* being many are *one bread and one body*, for we are all partakers of that one *bread*. Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar? What say I then? that the idol is any thing, or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is any thing? But I say that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils. Ye can not drink the *cup of the Lord* and the cup of devils: ye can not be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of devils."*

Q. What does St. Paul evidently mean by this?

A. He is warning the Corinthian Christians not to join in or countenance the idolatry around them. He tells them they can not do this and be Christians too: they can not join in heathen rites and Christian sacraments also; they "can not drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils;" they "can not be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of devils." Now this is all plain enough in a spiritual sense; that is, if he meant that the bread and wine are *emblems* or *signs* of Christ's body and blood, and that our real *communion* with him in the sacrament was not a matter of bodily eating and drinking, but of the soul's faith and love.†

* 1 Cor. 10 : 14-21 : "Wherefore, my dearly beloved, flee from the service of idols. I speak as to wise men; judge ye yourselves what I say. The chalice of benediction which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord? For we being many are one bread, one body, all who partake of one bread. Behold Israel according to the flesh; are not they who eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar? What then? Do I say that what is offered in sacrifice to idols is any thing? Or that the idol is any thing? But the things which the heathens sacrifice they sacrifice to devils and not to God. And I would not that you should be made partakers with devils; you can not drink the chalice of the Lord and the chalice of devils: you can not be partakers of the table of the Lord and of the table of devils."—Douay Bible.

† He also compares it to the way in which in the Jewish religion ("Israel," etc.,) men were "partakers" (*communicants*) by eating of the sacrifices. But no one ever imagined the changing of these sacrifices into some other substance.

But if we suppose that when he speaks of this "communion of the body and blood of Christ," of this 'cup and table of the Lord,' he means that the bread and wine have been actually *changed into* that body and blood, and that we have then swallowed it bodily—then he must mean also that *the flesh and wine of the heathen sacrifice were turned into the ACTUAL FLESH AND BLOOD OF DEVILS and so eaten by THEIR worshippers.*

Q. Does St. Paul speak of this sacrament again?

A. Yes. In the next chapter he blames the Corinthians for their improper way of celebrating it, saying: "When ye come together, therefore, into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper. For in eating every one taketh before other his own supper, and one is hungry and another is drunken. What! have ye not houses to eat and drink in? Or despise ye the Church of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you in this? I praise you not. For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it and said, Take, eat,* this is my body which is broken for you: *this do in remembrance of me.* After the same manner also he took the cup when he had supped, saying, *This cup is the New Testament in my blood:*† this do ye as oft as ye drink it *in remembrance of me.* For as often as ye eat *this bread* and drink *this cup*, ye do *show the Lord's death till he come.* Wherefore, whosoever shall eat *this bread* and drink *this cup* of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of *that bread* and drink of *that cup.* For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation (that is, *condemnation*) to himself, not discerning the Lord's body. For this cause many are weak and sickly

* The saying these words *before* saying, "This is my body," is a plain mark that there was no magical transformation to be worked by the latter.

† They who say so much of "the very words" are bound to take this literally also.

among you, and many sleep. *For if we would judge ourselves we should not be judged.* But when we are judged we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world. Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another; and if any man *hunger*, let him eat at home, that ye come not together unto condemnation. And the rest will I set in order when I come.”*

Q. We see St. Paul's words in full: what do they mean in substance?

A. He blames them severely for their careless and worldly way of celebrating this sacrament, and says that unless they communed seriously, piously, and thankfully, they did not do it “in remembrance” and celebration of the Lord's death; they did not “show forth his death till he come:” they consumed the bread and wine as they would at home, and not *in honor of the Lord*.

Q. Are those words in this sense “the most unintelligible gibberish that ever was uttered”? (See p. 265.)

A. They were thus written as that “holy man of old was moved by the Holy Ghost.”

* 1 Cor. 11 : 20-34 : “When you come together, therefore, into one place it is not now to eat the Lord's Supper. For every one taketh before his own supper to eat, and one indeed is hungry and another is drunk. What, have you not houses to eat and to drink in? Or despise ye the church of God and put them to shame that have not? What shall I say to you? Do I praise you? In this I praise you not. For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus, the night in which he was betrayed took bread, and giving thanks broke and said, Take ye and eat: this is my body which shall be delivered for you: do this for the commemoration of me. In like manner also the chalice after he had supped, saying, This chalice is the new testament in my blood; this do ye as often as ye shall drink it for the commemoration of me. For as often as you shall eat this bread and drink this chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until he come. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself; and so let him eat of that bread and drink of the chalice. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord. Therefore are there many infirm and weak among you, and many sleep. But if we would judge ourselves we should not be judged. But whilst we are judged we are chastised by the Lord: that we may not be damned with this world. Wherefore, my brethren, when you come together to eat, wait for one another. If any man be hungry, let him eat at home: that you come not together unto judgment. And the rest I will set in order when I come.”—Douay Bible.

Q. Could he have had a moment's thought of the notions of the Roman Church about these things?

A. Certainly not, for these plain reasons: First, He calls the matter of the sacrament, *bread and the cup* every time. Second, He says, "For as oft as ye eat *this bread* and drink *this cup*, ye do SHOW FORTH the *Lord's death* TILL HE COME:" that is, show a *memorial* or *sign* of him WHILE HE IS BODILY ABSENT FROM US.* Third, According to the other idea, he must have expressed the greatest horror at the thought of any one's *cramming himself with the living flesh and blood of Christ*, and have said that such frightful sacrilege was an unpardonable sin: instead of which he merely says: "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep." Fourth, He would have said something of adoring this body of the Lord present in the sacrament, *as the Roman Church is so strenuous about doing*.

Q. But are we still bound to believe that he meant what that Church says, because he did not say also: "Now I am afraid you will think I mean that the bread is real flesh, and the wine real blood, whereas they are only *figures* and *memorials* of these"?

A. No; for he could not have imagined that any one would understand him so; nor did men ever so explain St. Paul's words until many hundred years after, in the times of deepest superstition and ignorance.

Q. Could he not call the consecrated wine a "cup of blessing" without this notion?

A. Certainly: it *is* a "cup of blessing."

Q. Do *you* call the elements of the Eucharist "common bread and wine"?

A. Surely not, in the contemptuous sense intended by the Doctrinal Catechism; since they have been set apart from common uses to a most solemn and sacred one. But a thing may thus be *consecrated* (as the water of baptism is) without being *turned into the very substance* of the *Lord God Almighty*.

* Exactly so Theodoret, one of the wisest of the "Fathers," explains these words, "*Until he come*—For after this coming, there will be no more need of *symbols* or *signs* of his body, when that very body shall appear." (In 1 Cor. 11 : 20.)

Q. Can not this sacrament be a "communion of the body and blood of Christ" without such a change?

A. Yes; all devout Christians do in it commune or join with one another in "the Church *which is his body*,"* and with him in his most happy and holy *spiritual* presence, remembering and proclaiming together that by his cross and precious blood he has redeemed them. The low thought of eating and drinking actual flesh and blood would weaken and degrade this communion. Thus St. Paul says elsewhere: "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace, and joy, in the Holy Ghost."†

Q. Could he not call the consecrated bread and wine "the cup of the Lord" without meaning by this that it was *his blood*?

A. Surely; or else the "cup of *devils*" meant *devil's blood*.

Q. What of one's 'eating and drinking unworthily,' and so being "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, not discerning the Lord's body"?

A. He who uses these memorials of our Saviour's death profanely, *does* dishonor what is represented by them, that is, his "body and blood." If a man who was a hypocrite in heart were to be baptized would he not be profane and guilty, though it was only "*mere*" *water* that was used?

Q. What of a man's 'proving himself,' in order to come to this sacrament properly, or else 'eating and drinking damnation to himself'?

A. He who without seriously *meaning* what is shown in it, without penitent and grateful love for our most blessed Lord, Jesus Christ, performs this outward act of communion, condemns himself by his act, not seeing in his soul by faith what is represented in the sacrament. The "damnation" (condemnation) here spoken of does not mean that by a single act of this kind a man falls unpardonably into *eternal* damnation.

Q. Shall we then believe the Roman doctrine, though Scripture and common-sense are all against it, because otherwise the Holy

* Eph. 1 : 22, 23. So the Douay Bible.

† Rom. 14 : 19 : "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but justice and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost."—Douay Bible.

Communion of Christians will not be so noble as the manna or the Passover of the Jews?

A. This would be a most unworthy reason for not following the Law of our Lord. It is indeed the glory of his Church that its worship is by his command very simple in form but lofty in spirit. The Jews had manna and the Passover, the *bodily types*. We have the glorious *spiritual reality* in our Lord and king himself, who died for us and rose again and *reigns in heaven*. Why should we then be envious of the pomps of their worship, and discontented with the simple things by which he has told us to "*show forth his death till he come*" bodily in glorious majesty to judge the quick and the dead? Why should we Christians, in order to rival the Jews, pretend (for the things would and do remain the same substances, whatever we may *call* them) that this sacred bread and wine is not bread and wine, but divine flesh and blood?

In fact, however, the *spiritual* sacrament is more noble and dignified than the *material*. I call upon any candid and serious person to compare the effect of the two upon his mind, and to say whether the Protestant rite properly celebrated has not a greater solemnity and true spiritual majesty than that of the Roman Church in the same circumstances. We may add also that if Protestants are in the wrong, they either have no "bread from heaven," and so do not now live spiritually, and must perish forever, (John 6: 53.; see p. 253,) or they have the sacrament but do not "discern the Lord's body" in it, and are "eating and drinking judgment" (see p. 268) all of the time. Yet compare any number of average communicants among them with as many of the Roman Church, and we shall find them (so far as any one can judge) as pious and virtuous as the others: (I might justly say much more so.) How THEN CAN THIS BE? "*They have no means of grace,*" you remember, (see p. 69.) On the other hand, "*Jesus Christ in his body and blood, soul and divinity,*" (see p. 266,) *passes into many who lead scandalous lives!* HOW CAN THIS BE?

CHAP. IX.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Does not Dr. Adam Clarke, in "Discourse on the Holy Eucharist," London, 1808, say, that in the Syriac, the language used by Christ, there is no word that expresses "to signify or represent," and that hence Christ was compelled to say, "This IS my body," instead of "this REPRESENTS my body"?

A. Yes; but this assertion of Dr. Clarke has been expunged since by Mr. Horne, thus proving that Clarke was wrong. Dr. Lee of Cambridge (Proleg. to Bags-ter's Polygl. Bible) confesses that Clarke was in error; and the Right Rev. Dr. Wiseman, who is well qualified to judge in this matter, has discovered, in the Syriac, FORTY words expressing to *signify*, to *represent*, or *typify*. But the simplest answer to the objection is, that the Apostles, who wrote in *Greek*, had plenty of words meaning to *signify*. Why, then, did they use the word, *is*, when, to express Protestant doctrine, if they wish to teach such, they had an abundant choice of words?

Q. Does not St. Luke, chap. 22, say: "And having taken the chalice, he gave thanks, and said, Take and divide it among you; for I say to you, that I will not drink of the vine till the kingdom of God come"? And does not this prove that it was wine, and not his blood, which was in the chalice?

A. If Protestants would have patience to read the whole passage, and not leap at conclusions, they would see that the above words were uttered not over the sacramental cup, but over the wine that was drunk with the Paschal Lamb, immediately before Christ instituted the sacrament in verses 19, 20.

Q. Christ says, "This is the chalice, the new testament," etc.; and where we have these two figures, why may not the whole be figurative?

A. These figures were the simplest language to the Apostles, who were familiar with them. Every one says, this cup, this glass, meaning the contents of it; and the Apostles were accustomed to the language of Moses, "This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you," meaning that the blood

was not *of the covenant*, but its seal. Besides, Christ explains the figure in the words, "which shall be shed for you;" now, assuredly, it was not the chalice or wine that was shed, but his blood.

Q. St. Paul, 1 Cor. chap. 11, says: "Do this for the commemoration or in remembrance of me." Now, we do not remember things present, but things absent; hence Christ is not present in the sacrament.

A. This is a mere quibble. Eccles. chap. 12, says: "Remember thy Creator in the days of thy youth." Now, will any Protestant be fool enough to say, that, in the days of our youth, our Creator is absent from us? Besides, Christ is not *visibly* present, as he was when addressing the Apostles; hence, inasmuch as he is now *invisible*, he may be said to be *absent*. In fine, the sacrament is a memorial of his death; and the real death of Jesus is not a thing *present* in the Holy Eucharist, but is only represented in it. 1 Cor. chap. 11: "As often as you eat this bread, etc., you shall *show the death of the Lord* till he come."

Q. Can a thing be a *memorial* of itself?

A. Yes; the manna preserved in the Ark was so; Aaron's rod was preserved as a memorial of itself, with which Moses wrought so many miracles; the victims eaten by the Israelites were memorials of the same victims offered on the altar.

Q. May not these words, "This is my body," etc., be understood as these others, "I am the door," "I am the vine"?

A. No, for many reasons. 1st, Nothing was previously said by Christ to prepare the Apostles for believing that he was really to become a vine or a door, whilst he wrought a tremendous miracle, and addressed them in a long discourse, to prepare them to believe that the bread he was to give them should be his own flesh. 2dly, When Christ says, "I am the *door*"—John, chap. 10—the Scripture itself, verse 6th, declares, that he was speaking figuratively. "This *PROVERB* Jesus spoke to them, *but they understood not.*" Christ, seeing this, immediately explains the figure: "I am the door into the sheepfold; by my doctrine and through my blood all must enter. If any man enter in, he shall

be saved. *I am the good shepherd*; the good shepherd giveth his life for his sheep." In John, chap. 15, where he says he is the vine, he explains himself instantly, by calling us the *branches*; showing, that *we* must live by *his* grace, as the vine-branch lives by the sap of the vine—that we must be united to him by love and obedience, as he was by these united to his Father. Now, when Christ says, "This is my body," he does not even hint that he is speaking figuratively; he enters into no explanation whatever. The Jews are scandalized—his disciples leave him—all exclaim, This is a hard saying; yet he repeats the same truth in the same words: "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you."

Q. May not Jesus Christ, when he said, "This is my body," have spoken figuratively, like St. Paul, when he said, 1 Cor. chap. 10, "and the rock was Christ"?

A. No; for St. Paul is merely preaching, where figures are allowed and useful; whilst Christ is instituting a sacrament, at the most awful moment of his life, in the act of making his last will and testament; and every one will grant, that here rhetorical figures and flowers would be highly unbecoming. Besides, there is no figure in the words of St. Paul, if carefully examined. He proposes the cloud and the passage of the Red Sea as a figure of baptism—the manna as a figure of the body, and the water of the Rock of Horeb as a figure of the blood of Christ. He then says: "And all drank the same *spiritual* drink; they drank of the *spiritual* rock that followed them, and the rock (spiritual) was Christ." And was not Christ the *true spiritual* rock, from whose wounds, as from spiritual fountains, all believers, both prospectively and retrospectively, drank (not as the Jews, from the material and figurative rock Horeb) the spiritual waters of eternal life? The word *spiritual* explains the whole, and does away with the figure.

Q. May not the substantive verb "is," in the text, "This is my body," mean *represents*, as the same verb "is" means *represents* in Exodus, chap. 12: "You shall eat (the flesh of the Lamb) in haste, for it is the Phase (or Passover) of the Lord"?

A. No, not at all; though on the force of this text Zwinglius became so bold as to deny transubstantiation, declaring, that he was in a dream reminded of this text by some "*white or black monitor.*" The fact is, that the verb *is* does not mean *represent* in this passage. Even Rosenmüller, *one of the most learned Protestant commentators*, maintains, that the word *is* should be here taken literally; the original has, This is the pass-over *to* the Lord, or this is the *day* or *feast-day* of the passover *sacred to* the Lord. The very same construction of language is used in Exodus 10, "This is the Sabbath *to* the Lord," which we have "this is the Sabbath *of* the Lord." The same again occurs in Exodus 32 : 5 : "The festival of the Lord," for "the festival *to* the Lord." And, finally, in the 27th verse of the very chapter under discussion : "This is the sacrifice *of* the Lord's passover"—that is, in the original : "This is the sacrifice of the passover *sacred to* the Lord." So that the verb *is* does not here mean *represent* at all, but is to be understood literally. How amusingly inconsecutive are Protestants in their arguments against Catholicism ! In a few Scriptural instances the verb *to be* means *to represent*, whilst in ten thousand instances it is to be understood literally; therefore, like true philosophers, they conclude, because it suits their views, that in these words—"this is my body"—the word *is* must be understood, not literally, but figuratively, whilst every circumstance connected with the above text goes to prove the contrary.

Q. Do not the Scriptures represent the body of Christ as in heaven, which he is not to quit till the "times of the restitution of all things"—that is, until the end of the world ?

A. Yes ; but the Scriptures assure us, that his body is also in the Eucharist ; therefore we believe both. Those who make this objection will find, that our Lord, *after his ascension*, appeared visibly to St. Paul in the castle of Jerusalem.

Q. Does not Christ himself say, Mark, chap. 14 : "The poor you have always with you, but me ye have not always" ?

A. Yes ; but he speaks here of his mortal and visible presence ; for he elsewhere says : "I will be with you all days, even to the end."

Q. St. Paul calls the sacrament *bread*, 1 Cor. 11, therefore it is bread?

A. He calls it bread, because it has the *appearance* of bread; but he calls it *THIS bread*, clearly showing that it has something extraordinary about it. He calls it bread, but he says that he who partakes of it, partakes of the *body of Christ*. Christ called it bread; but he adds, the bread which I will give you is my flesh, for the life of the world. Again, we have many examples of Scripture, in which the thing changed bears the name of that from which it is transubstantiated. Thus, Gen. 2, Eve is called the *bone* of Adam; in Gen. 3, Adam is called *dust*, because he is made from *dust*; Exodus 7, Aaron's rod is called a *rod*, after it became a serpent; John 2, the *water* after being changed into wine, is called *water*. The Scripture, too, often calls things what they *appear* to be. Thus, Gen. 17, *angels* in human form, are called *men*.

CHAP. IX.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What can you say of this chapter?

A. Since we have already so clearly come at the facts and common-sense of this question, I will not ask a reader to follow me in a full review of this chapter, compelling him to wade with me again through this mass of confused, laborious, and contradictory arguing, about "Dr. Adam Clarke," 'a thing being a memorial of itself,' the "tremendous miracle," 'a Protestant being *fool enough* to say,' etc., etc. But there are a few things worth noting as specimens of this sort of arguing. 1st, It says that our Lord's calling the wine of the Eucharist, "the (fruit of) the vine," was "uttered NOT *over the sacramental cup*, but," etc., and quotes St. Luke for this. Would you believe, then, that *St. Matthew's gospel* has these words: "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. *But*

I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of THIS FRUIT OF THE VINE until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom !"* 2d. In order to get out of a difficulty with the words of St. Paul, "As often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you show forth the Lord's death till he come," it says: "The sacrament is a *memorial* of his death, and the real death of Jesus is not a thing *present* in the Holy Eucharist, but is *only represented* in it," *which is just what we say.* 3d. It does not appear to notice the last words—"till he come"—which are *conclusive* that the Lord is NOT BODILY PRESENT in the sacrament. 4th. It admits that St. Paul says, "*this bread,*" but argues, that because he says "*this bread,*" *therefore* IT IS NO BREAD AT ALL, but *the flesh of Christ!*

CHAP. X.—DOC. CATECHISM.

On Transubstantiation.

Q. What do you mean by Transubstantiation ?

A. To comprehend this, we must observe, that in all bodies there are two things to be noted : 1st, the *outward appearances*, such as taste, smell, shape, color, etc. ; and 2dly, the matter or substance in which these qualities reside. The sensible qualities are objects of knowledge, which we can acquire by the testimony of the senses, but we can form no notion of the nature or structure of the inward substance ; it is beyond the reach of even our conception. Now, with regard to the Holy Eucharist, our faith teaches us, that "*this inward imperceptible substance* of the bread and wine, is, at the consecration, by the Almighty power of God, changed into the substance of the body and blood of

* 26 : 27-29 : "And taking the chalice, he gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of this. For this is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many for the remission of sins. And I say to you, I will not drink from henceforth of this fruit of the vine until the day when I shall drink it new with you in the kingdom of my Father."—Douay Bible.

Christ," all the *outward sensible qualities* remaining entirely the same as before consecration. (Council of Trent, Sess. xiii. cap. 4.)

Q. Can you show that such a change took place?

A. Yes; for when Christ took the bread into his hands, it was still bread; but when he gave it to his disciples, he declares that it is his body: "This is my body." His words can not be false; by declaring it to be his body, he made it so. The change did not take place in the *outward sensible qualities*; therefore it took place in the *inward substance*.

Q. May it not be said that his body is with the bread?

A. No; for Christ does not say: *In this bread, or with this bread, or under this bread, or this bread eaten by faith, or with this bread when you receive it, is my body*; but he simply says: **THIS IS MY BODY**. What Christ held in his hand could not be *bread* and his *body* at *one and the same time*.

Q. Does the Scripture, by any other example than this, show that the word of Christ, affirming that a thing is what it was not before, is sufficient to produce the effect?

A. Yes; the ruler—John 4 : 49, 50—says to Christ: "Sir, come down before my son die. Jesus saith to him: Go thy way, *thy son liveth*; and it was the *same hour* that Jesus said to the ruler, *Thy son liveth, that the fever left him*." (Verse 53.)

Q. How is such a change possible?

A. You may as well ask how was the world created out of *nothing*; how were the waters of Egypt turned into blood; the dry rod into a living serpent; the water into wine at Cana.

Q. How can one substance exist under the outward appearances of another?

A. As easily as angels who appeared to God's servants in the Old Law, under the outward appearance of men, and spoke, and walked, and ate, as if they really were men. Luke 3 : 22, the Holy Ghost appeared under the *bodily shape of a dove*; and Acts 2 : 3, under the form of "*parted tongues of fire*."

Q. How can the body of Christ be in many places at one and the same time?

A. We know little of glorified bodies, or their qualities and perfection; but we know that they are not like mortal bodies. How did our Saviour's body pass through the stone with which his sepulchre was closed? (Mark 15 : 46.) How did his body pass through the door? (John 20 : 19, 26.) How did he, whilst in heaven, after his ascension, appear to St. Paul? (1 Cor. chap. 15.) In fine, the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves and fishes (Mark 6 : 40) was intended and calculated to meet and remove the objections of unbelievers on this subject; the loaves and fishes having been miraculously though invisibly endued with the properties of extension and inexhaustibleness, so as to feed five thousand men with five loaves and two fishes, and four thousand with seven loaves and a few small fishes. (Mark 8 : 6.)

Q. Perhaps each one only took a little?

A. No; for the Scripture says, *they did ALL eat, and had their FILL*, and there were twelve baskets of fragments remaining.

Q. Perhaps, then, Christ created new loaves and fishes?

A. No; for again the Scripture declares, that "*the TWO FISHES he divided among THEM ALL*," and that "*they filled twelve baskets of the fragments of the FIVE BARLEY LOAVES*."

Q. How can the body of Christ be contained under the compass of a small host?

A. Our Saviour says, that our bodies shall become like the angels—that it is possible for God to make a camel pass through the eye of a needle; and how did the body of Christ pass through the *door* and through the *stone*?

Q. Are not the senses deceived in this matter?

A. Not at all; the senses can only be employed on external qualities; they are not exercised on substance. In the sacrament, the external appearances are those of bread and wine; the senses perceive these, and therefore they perceive all that is within their province. As

well might you say, the senses were deceived in Christ, who was God-man, and yet appeared to be only man, or in the Holy Ghost, when he appeared under the form of a dove.

Q. How can the same thing appear under two different forms, as under the form of *bread* and *wine*?

A. The Holy Ghost appeared under the form of a *dove*, (Luke 3 : 22;) and under the form of *parted tongues*, (Acts 2 : 3.)

Q. Has the doctrine of transubstantiation been believed in every age of the Church?

A. No portion of Christian doctrine is better attested. St. Ambrose, lib. iv. de Sacra. chap. 4, says: "Before the consecration, bread only is present; but after the sacred words are pronounced, the bread is changed into the body of our Lord." And St. Gregory of Nyssa, in his Large Catechism, chap. 37, declares: "I firmly believe that the bread is changed into the body of Jesus Christ."

CHAP. X.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. If in the Last Supper our Lord had made a magical change of bread and wine into his actual flesh and blood, (and if he did so still every time those words were repeated by a priest,) what words would he doubtless have used?

A. He would have said, "LET THIS BECOME my body," etc.

Q. *In fact* when now the words, "This is my body," etc., are pronounced, do the bread and wine become actual flesh and blood?

A. No; I see that they do not change at all in their appearance, which proves of itself that the words are true only in a *spiritual* and *figurative* sense.

Q. But the Doctrinal Catechism says that the *appearances* remain the same, yet the *substance* is exchanged for *some other substance*?

A. This we may safely call nonsense. I can not know of any "substance," except by my senses noticing its qualities. The notion that the *qualities* of the bread are only *a sort of shell* inside of which the *substance* is,

and that this substance is taken out and another substance (the body of Christ) put into the old shell of qualities which the bread had, has no reason in it, and can only be called *nonsense*.

Q. When was this strange idea first heard of?

A. In the midst of the Dark Ages. The barbarous word for it, "*Transubstantiation*" is not in the Holy Scriptures nor in any Christian writer for one thousand years after the Apostles.

Q. Do we reject this notion merely because we can not see how the thing is possible?

A. No; it is plain from Scripture, common-sense, and history, that our Lord *never did say* what the Roman Church makes him say; and that decides the question. Yet it is not amiss to show that this "*Transubstantiation*" is, as a human invention, of itself highly improbable, if not absolutely impossible.

Q. But suppose you are told that this is a *miracle*, that your senses have nothing to do with it, that all you need to believe it is faith—that to think God *can not* make this great change when he says that he *does*, is impious, etc., etc.?

A. I do not think *that he says so*. A *miracle* is *presented* to the senses and meant to convince men *through their senses*. Thus when our Lord turned water into wine, they knew that it was become wine by its *looks*, and *taste*, and *smell*. He did not say: "This is wine now. Though it looks, and tastes, and smells like *water*, you must believe it to be *wine*." Yet this is what we are asked to believe of the wine of the Roman Eucharist.

Q. Can it be then that we are in this like those who refuse to believe the Trinity of God because they can not understand it?

A. The Trinity is a mere matter of faith in God: the *senses* have nothing to do with it either way. We can not by sight or touch or any other sense know that there are not Three Persons in the one God. But this bread and wine are *presented to the senses*, and *I know what they are* BY THOSE SENSES. If they were changed by a miracle, then I would see the bread become flesh before my eyes, and the wine turn into warm blood.

Q. Notice some of the apologies for this monstrous fancy, attempted by the Doctrinal Catechism in this chapter?

A. 1st, To "show that the word of Christ affirming that a thing is what it was not before, is sufficient to produce the effect,"* we have the case of the ruler's son brought forward. Surely there was no "transubstantiation" here. The Lord did not *change the body of this child into some other substance*. He was the *same child* well, instead of dying. 2d, That "one substance can exist under the outward appearance of another," "because the Holy Ghost appeared under the bodily shape of a dove," and at another time in that of "parted tongues of fire." In this case something *spiritual* was shown to the *bodily* eyes of men. Is this like the supposed "transubstantiation" in which *real matter*, bread which I saw just now, is no longer here, *though my eyes see it still*, but *there is something else in the place of it*? 3d, The notion of the same substance (the body of Christ) being in *two different forms at the same time* is excused because the Holy Ghost appeared in both of the forms mentioned above. But was it *in both of these forms AT THE SAME TIME*? and 4th, Its being *in many different places* at the same time, is excused because we know nothing of glorified bodies; and our Lord's passing through (?) the stone of the sepulchre and the door of a room after his resurrection, are also mentioned. If there *could* be any force in this reasoning, it would be sadly damaged by two facts, 1st, that *an angel rolled away the stone from the tomb* for him to pass out, (see Matt. 28 : 2,) and 2d, that he probably *opened the door* of the room to enter. Yet we need not puzzle ourselves with any such questions since it is plain that "Transubstantiation" is no ancient truth of God, but an invention of men, and not a thousand years old.

Q. What of the words quoted from Ambrose, etc.?

A. They are highly figurative, perhaps too much so, to the point of superstition. But they were not meant

* Which we do not deny in general, but only in its application to this "*Transubstantiation*."

in the gross material sense of the Roman Church, as is plain from the words of Ambrose, already quoted on page 360. The same might be shown of each of the other writers cited. Besides, *it is certain* that the early Christian never *adored* the "host" as those who believe in Transubstantiation do now naturally enough. Could they have believed the body and blood of our Lord to be literally before their eyes without offering worship to them? This fact then alone, is fatal to that notion. Even six hundred years after Ambrose, when the worship of the bread and wine was beginning to prevail in Europe, a homily for Easter Day used to be read in all the Churches of England, in which were these plain words against this notion, and others like them: "By nature it is corruptible bread and wine, and is by the power of the divine word, truly Christ's body and blood; not, however, bodily but spiritually. *Great is the difference between the body in which Christ suffered and the body which is hallowed for housel, (eucharist.)* Verily, Christ's body which suffered death and from death arose, will henceforth never die, but is eternal and impassible. *The housel is temporal not eternal, corruptible,* and is distributed piece-meal; chewed betwixt the teeth, etc. But it is, as we before said, Christ body and blood, *not bodily but spiritually.*"*

CHAP. XI.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Is Christ permanently present in the sacrament, that is, at any other time than when it is received?

A. He is really and permanently present from and after the time the words of consecration are pronounced.

Q. How do you prove this?

A. At the moment Christ finished the pronounciation of these words, "This is my body," either his body was there, or his words were not true: the latter is

* Homil. Ælfric. ii. 271, 273.

blasphemy ; therefore, his body was present, but the disciples had not yet received it—there it was, present at other than the *moment in which it was received*.

Q. Throw a little more light on this.

A. Christ did not say, *This shall be my body when you receive it*, but absolutely, *this is my body*. The *present*, and not the *future time*, is marked by the word *is*.

Q. If the Lutheran doctrine in this matter were true, what would be the consequence ?

A. That the body of Christ would be present, not by virtue of the words of consecration, but by virtue of the manducation, which is a gross absurdity.

Q. What says St. Ambrose—Lib. iv. de Sacr. chap. 4 ?

A. "The words of consecration are as efficacious as those employed by God in the creation of the world." Hence the body of Christ is present immediately after the words of consecration, as the world existed immediately after the pronunciation of the words which drew it out of nothing.

Q. Repeat St. Cyril in his Epistle to Coelosyrius ?

A. "None but a fool," he says, "can imagine that the consecrated host loses its virtue immediately after consecration."

Q. Have you any other proof of the permanent presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist ?

A. Yes ; the Primitive Church preserved the Eucharist for the sick in holy vessels. In times of persecution, it was kept for a considerable time ; and the bishops were wont to send it, one to another, as a mark of their strict union.

Q. How long does Jesus Christ remain under the species ?

A. As long as the species exist.

Q. If the blessed sacrament should fall into fire or water, would Jesus Christ suffer or be insulted ?

A. He would be insulted if this happened by the fault of man ; but if by accident, no insult would be offered to him ; He is immortal and impassible—he can suffer no more ; and in the cases mentioned, or any other such, the species only are consumed or changed.

CHAP. XI.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What must we say of the discussion whether "Christ is *permanently* present in the Eucharist" ?

A. It is a part of the laborious and superstitious trifling in which those who put this gross and foolish meaning upon that holy sacrament are forced to employ themselves.

Q. What other specimen of this is there in the same chapter ?

A. The question as to what would become of the Lord's body, *if it "should fall into fire or water."* "The *species* (appearances) only are consumed" ! Common-sense speaks of *substances* being consumed but knows nothing of the CONSUMING OF APPEARANCES !

Q. Can you mention any other remarkable superstitions to which this doctrine of the Roman Church gives rise ?

A. Yes ; the writers of the Dark Ages had long discussions as to what would become of the Lord's body in the sacrament, *if a mouse should eat it*, etc., etc. Instructions, in case of such accidents, are retained in the Roman Missal (prayer-book) to this day.*

Q. What does the practice of the second and third centuries of preserving the consecrated bread and sending it to one another, prove ?

A. If any thing, that they had no notion of "Transubstantiation ;" or they would not have exposed the sacred flesh of God the Son to the risks and insults of those persecuting times. No ; it was to them as to us, the dearest emblem and pledge of their love for the Lord and Saviour, and for one another. They treated it with great reverence, for it had been very solemnly set apart from common uses to the worship of God. *So would I now* ; but this no more means that I think it God himself than my respect for a church building makes me think that it has been "transubstantiated" into the body of the Lord.

* See Rubrics *De Defectibus Missæ*. Also Gavantus i. 345, etc.

Q. Did those writers among the heathen and the Jews who wrote against the first Christians, speak of their believing that bread and wine were turned into the actual body of God?

A. No ; though they ridicule all the belief and worship of the Christians. If this notion, which to say the least is strange, had prevailed in the Church, then it could not have failed to draw out all their raillery. Among others, Julian the Apostate had been a communicant and fully acquainted with the Christian doctrine. Yet afterwards, when he was the bitterest enemy of the Church, and reviled all its worship, he never spoke of their believing that bread and wine by a few words became God's body and blood. COULD THIS HAVE BEEN IF THAT WAS THEN THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE?

CHAP. XII.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Should we adore Jesus Christ in the blessed sacrament of the Eucharist?

A. Certainly ; because he, whom all the angels adore, is truly present on our altars.

Q. Are Catholics justified in kneeling before the blessed sacrament when it is carried past them in the street, either to the sick, or in religious processions?

A. Yes ; more than justified ; for if, according to Scripture, we bend the knee at the *name* of Jesus, how much more are we bound to do so before his *sacred person*.

Q. Do Catholics act properly in carrying the adorable sacrament with religious pomp and solemnity in processions?

A. If the Israelites carried the ark of the alliance with great solemnity, Catholics have much more reason to carry in triumph the holy sacrament, of which the ark was only a mere figure.

Q. May it not be said, that Jesus Christ is in the sacrament, not seeking our adorations, but to be the spiritual food of our souls?

A. Jesus Christ was in the crib of Bethlehem, not to be adored merely, yet the Magi neglected not to adore

him. He cured the man born blind, not merely to receive that man's adoration, yet that man neglected not to give it him. Wherever Jesus Christ is, there he is to be received and adored with sovereign honors. St. August. super Psal. 98, says: "It is sinful to neglect to adore Jesus Christ in the Eucharist." St. Ambrose, Lib. iii. de Sanct. Spirit. chap. 12, says: "We adore Jesus Christ during the celebration of the sacred mysteries."

Q. Are the Lutherans agreed upon this point?

A. No; Kemnitius and his partisans order the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist; Illyricus and his party forbid it.

CHAP. XII.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Should we then adore the bread and wine in this sacrament?

A. No more than we should the water of Baptism or the walls of a church, which are like those elements *consecrated* to God.

Q. What sort of worship is alone proper?

A. "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."*

Q. Should we thus *spiritually* adore our Lord the Saviour of the world and the King of heaven, *when we celebrate this sacrament*

A. "Yes, verily, and by God's help, so I will." All the prayers and praises of this sacrament are full of his worship. *This we do in remembrance of HIM.* So we say with Augustine, "It is sinful to neglect to adore Jesus Christ in the Eucharist," and with Ambrose, "We adore Jesus Christ during the celebration of the sacred mysteries."

And now you who read this, pause and consider these two facts: 1st, That the Church generally throughout the world, did, in the Dark Ages, fall into the absurd belief of "Transubstantiation" in the Lord's Supper; and, 2d, That afterwards, when the heavenly Lord of

* John 4: 24: "God is a spirit, and they that adore him must adore him in spirit and in truth."—Douay Bible.

the Universal Church put it into the hearts of some to lead their fellow-Christians back from this and other false doctrines to the pure truth, the Roman Church set itself against the reform, and has remained in these foolish superstitions ever since, issuing curses and plying persecutions against all more wise, free, and spiritual Christians.



On the Sacrament of Penance and Confession.

CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. For what end was the sacrament of Penance instituted?

A. For the remission of sins committed after baptism.

Q. Is it a true sacrament?

A. Yes; because it has all the essentials of a sacrament—the *outward sign* in the sentence of absolution pronounced by the priest—the *inward grace* in the sanctifying grace of God, by which our sins are forgiven—and it is evidently *instituted by Jesus Christ*.

Q. Where?

A. In Matt. chap. 9, Jesus heals the man sick of the palsy, and says to him: "Be of good heart, thy sins are forgiven thee." The Jews say: "He blasphemeth." Jesus replies, that he works this miracle, that they might know "that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins." "And the multitude seeing it feared, and glorified God who had given such power to men." Here Christ works a tremendous miracle to prove that he, *as man*, can forgive sins, and the people glorify God who had given such power to men.

Q. What do you conclude from this?

A. That Jesus Christ, even as man, had this power from his Father.

Q. Does he communicate this power, which he certainly had, to the pastors of the Church?

A. On the very day of his resurrection, he says to

them, John 20 : 21, "As my Father hath sent me, I also send you;" but he himself, even as man, had, by the above text, power from his Father to forgive sins; therefore he gave this power to his Apostles.

Q. What does he immediately add, to clear away all doubt as to this power?

A. "Breathing upon them, he said: Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose sins ye shall retain, they are retained." Again, Matt. 18 : 18, Christ says: "Amen, I say to you, whatsoever ye shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven."

Q. What says St. Chrysostom on these passages?

A. "To the priests is given a power, which God would not give to angels or archangels; earthly princes have the power of binding the body, but the binding of the priest reaches even to the soul: . . . what the priests do below, God ratifies above, and the master confirms the sentence of the servants."

Q. Can the priest forgive or retain sin as he pleases?

A. No; he is bound to act as St. Paul did, when he pardoned the incestuous Corinthian. The Apostle declares, that what he did, "*he did it in the person of Christ,*" (2 Cor. 2.) The priest acts in the person of Christ, and does only what Christ would do for the sincere penitent.

Q. Is it not blasphemy to say that man can forgive sins?

A. Certainly it is blasphemy to say, that men, *not commissioned by God* for that purpose, can do so; but it is no blasphemy to say, that men may have that power, and have that power *from God*, since the Apostles were men, and yet they certainly had such power.

Q. On what conditions can the lawfully-ordained and commissioned priest exercise this power?

A. The penitent, to be absolved, must *detest his sins*; he must be firmly resolved to *avoid sin and its occasions* in future; he must *be willing to submit to whatever penance the priest imposes*; and, if able, he must *confess all his sins*.

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Ought we to confess our sins to God?

A. Yes, truly. He has commanded all men to confess all their sins to him in secret and in public prayer, so that they may ask and receive his forgiveness; and pious men have done so from the beginning of the world. Thus it is said in the 32d Psalm: "I said I will confess my transgressions *unto the Lord*, and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin. For this shall every one that is godly pray unto thee," etc.*

Q. Should we ever also confess our sins to a fellow-man?

A. Yes; when we have done a wrong to him, or need the advice and the prayers of a wise and godly friend; or, having done a public and outrageous wrong, wish to make our repentance as well known as our sin has been.

Q. Is each of these kinds of confession mentioned in the word of God?

A. Yes; for both public and private confession to God alone, see Neh. 9:3, and Dan. 9:14; for confession also to our fellow-men, James 5:16: "Confess your faults *one to another* and *pray for one another* that ye may be healed." Acts 19:18: "And many that believed came and *confessed* and *showed their evil deeds*."†

Q. Were these confessions practised among the first Christians (as they are by Protestants now)?

A. Yes. Shameful sins, which being known by others, brought disgrace on the Church, were punished with perhaps excessive severity in the days of "the Fathers," by the offenders being compelled to make a *public* confession. But all other sins were supposed to

* 5, 6: "I said I will confess against myself my injustice to the Lord; and thou hast forgiven the wickedness of my sin. For this shall every one that is holy pray to thee," etc.—Donay Bible.

† "Confess, therefore, your sins one to another, and pray for one another that you may be saved." "And many of those who believed came confessing and declaring their deeds."—Donay Bible.

be things which should be told *only and secretly to God*; unless the sinner should think best to confide them to a wise friend, or, if another person had been wronged, to confess it to him with an offer to repair the wrong. Thus (St.) Chrysostom says: "For this reason I exhort and entreat and beseech you to make your confession continually *unto God*. For I do not bring thee before thy fellow-servants, *nor compel thee to reveal thy sins unto men*. Unfold thy conscience before *God*, and show him thy wounds, and ask the cure of him. Show them to him who will not reproach but heal them."*

Q. What is the doctrine of the Roman Church about *confession*?

A. That it is only a matter transacted between each Christian and his pastor; the former going to the latter when he chooses, and telling him all his bad acts and thoughts, and receiving from him a full pardon of them. Here are the very words in which that Church describes this, (see Catechism of the Council of Trent, Sacrament of Penance, p. ,) "The power with which the priests of the New Law are invested *is not simply to declare that sins are forgiven, but as the ministers of God, really to absolve from sin*."—"Humbled in spirit, the sincere penitent *casts himself down at the feet of the priest*, to testify by this his humble demeanor that he acknowledges the necessity of eradicating pride, the root of all those enormities which he now deploras. In the minister of God who sits in the tribunal of penance as his legitimate judge, *he venerates the power and person of our Lord Jesus Christ*." The penitent then says, "I confess to Almighty God, *to the blessed Mary, ever Virgin, to blessed Michael, the Archangel, to blessed John Baptist, to the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and to all the saints, and to you, father*, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, through my fault, etc." (Then he mentions the different sins which he remembers, the priest also asking *particular questions* about whatever he chooses, and concludes with these words,) "Therefore I *beseech the blessed*

* Hom. v. De Incomp. Dei. Nat.

Mary, ever Virgin, the blessed Michael, the Archangel, blessed John the Baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and all the saints, and you, father, to pray to our Lord God for me." The priest then commands the penitent to perform some penance or *satisfaction* as "*a compensation made by man to God by doing something in atonement for the sins which he has committed.*" And lastly, the priest, if he chooses, absolves (or pardons) the other. This is the "sacrament of penance and confession," to which "*belongs in so special a manner the efficacy of remitting actual guilt, that without its intervention WE CAN NOT OBTAIN OR EVEN HOPE FOR PARDON.*"

Q. Is this like the general spirit and language of the Holy Scriptures?

A. It seems very unlike them. It begins with a degrading homage to a fellow-man, while St. Peter said to Cornelius who fell down at his feet, "Stand up: I also am a man."* It includes confession and prayer to deceased saints, and so it is a part of that worship of such persons which I have already seen to be so wrong. It must be kept secret, whatever terrible wrong may come from that secrecy. It pretends to an *atonement* for sin by the act of the sinner, while, as we have seen, our Lord and Saviour has made all the atonement that can be. And it puts words in the mouth of a man that seem proper only in God.

Q. Yet, if there are plain words of Scripture to describe and command all this, will you not yield to them?

A. Yes, truly, and with all my heart; for when God speaks in contradiction of my thoughts, I know that there is some mistake in *them*.

Q. What do you say then to these verses of Scripture: "'As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.' And when he had said this, he breathed on them and saith unto them, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained.'" Also, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

A. There is not a word in them about *confession*,

* Acts 10 : 12: "Arise, I myself also am a man."—Douay Bible.

much less of its being *secret* or *to a Roman priest*, or *to the saints*, or of a *sinner's atoning for his sins by "doing penance."* Most plainly then they do not describe this thing which we have already seen to be so contrary to the general spirit of Scripture.

Q. But, you see, the Doctrinal Catechism does argue for the Roman confession from these words. What reply will you make to its arguments?

A. First, Why such laborious and far-fetched reasoning? Bring me *one plain sentence* of the word of God commanding this secret confession to a priest. Second, It is by no means certain that these words, "As my Father," etc., and, "Whosoever sins," etc., were spoken at the time to the *Apostles alone* and not to *all the disciples*, that is, to *all members of the Church*, and so describe some powers which the whole body of the Church together, ministers and people, can exercise. Read over the whole of the chapters in which they occur and judge for yourself. On one of these occasions probably other believers beside the Apostles were present, and *certainly one Apostle* (St. Thomas) was *absent*. Third, As we have no account of the Apostles afterwards ever absolving from sins as Roman priests do now, much less hearing secret confession, we have reason to think that they understood by these words of our Lord simply, that the Church was to *preach the Gospel of pardon*; admit members into its holy society; rebuke and punish them when necessary for their good and as an example to others, and expel them if utterly unworthy; and that the Apostles should make laws for its government, and, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, write what was yet left unwritten of the word of God, and do whatever else belonged to them as the inspired first and highest officers of the Church. And what was thus done by the Church on earth, he, its King, would confirm in heaven. Fourth, It is not said, that the powers of the *Apostles* passed to every *priest*.

Q. Have priests this power because the Lord said, "As my Father hath sent me so send I you;" and he had "*power to forgive sins*"?

A. This is to be understood according to common-sense. "The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of

the world," and "to give his life a ransom for many."* But no man can be like him *in this*: and so it is with his *divine power to forgive sins*. But he came also to bring the glad tidings of this great joy which should be to all nations. So he *sends* the Church and especially its pastors to 'preach this gospel to every creature.'

Q. Did the first Christians believe with the Doctrinal Catechism that our Lord Christ "did as *man* forgive sins," and that he "communicated this power to the pastors of the Church"?

A. No. (St.) Athanasius proves our Lord to be God by this: "How if the word was a creature could he loose the sentence of God and pardon sin, it being written by the prophets that *this belongs to God?* *How was it then possible that sin should be pardoned by created beings?* But the Lord himself did pardon them."† (St.) Ambrose: "This can not be common to any man with Christ to forgive sins. This is the prerogative of Christ alone, who took away the sins of the world."‡

Q. What must we say then of him who, because Christ our Lord and God could forgive sins, claims in these days in this respect to "REPRESENT THE CHARACTER AND DISCHARGE THE FUNCTIONS OF JESUS CHRIST"?

A. I can but say with serious truth what the Jews falsely said of our Lord, "*he blasphemeth.*" (If there be devout men who do this now, they will sorrowfully confess their mistake one of these days.)

Q. Does it excuse this blasphemy for such a man to say that he is "commissioned by God for this"?

A. No; for whatever he may *say*, it is plain that God has never given him such authority.

Q. What of the words of Chrysostom quoted by the Doctrinal Catechism?

A. They show the superstitious veneration for the clergy which was beginning to prevail in those days, (three hundred years after the Apostles,) and the extravagant language which one of the best men of the time could use about them. But they relate only to

* 1 John 4 : 14: "The Father hath sent his son to be the Saviour of the world."—Douay Bible. Matt. 20 : 28: "To give his life a redemption for many."—Douay Bible.

† Contra. Arian. Orat. iii.

‡ Ep. 76 ad Studium.

public discipline of the Church, and not to this *Roman confession*, which was not then known at all. Here is one of many proofs of this. The same Chrysostom says: "No one can pardon sins but God alone."* How different this is from the language of the Doctrinal Catechism!

Q. When did *confession* like that of the Roman Church begin?

A. Early in the Dark Ages. Though it had been at times before observed as a voluntary custom by some monks to whom Basil recommended it, and by others, it was first made a *law* for a company of monks by Chrodegang, Bishop of Mentz, (A.D. 763,) seven hundred years after the Apostles. Fleury says: "*This is the FIRST TIME that I find CONFESSION COMMANDED.*"†

CHAP II.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Is the confession of sin a modern practice?

A. No; it is as ancient as revealed religion.

Q. How do you prove this?

A. In the first place, from the clearest testimony of the Old Law: "When a man or woman shall have committed any of all the sins that men are wont to commit, and, by negligence, shall have transgressed the commandment of the Lord, they shall *confess their sin*, and restore the principal, and a fifth part over and above." (Num. 5: 6.) Here we have not only confession, but penance and restitution.

Q. Quote other passages on this important matter?

A. "He that hideth his sins shall not prosper; but he that shall *confess* and shall forsake them shall obtain mercy." (Prov. 28: 13.) "Be not ashamed to *say the truth* for the sake of thy soul; for there is a shame that *bringeth sin*, and a shame that *bringeth glory and grace.*" (See also Ecclus. 6: 24, 31.)

* In ii. ad Cor. Hom. vi. 4.

† IX. 426.

Q. Did the practice of confession exist immediately before the coming of Christ?

A. Certainly; for it is said of the immediate forerunner of Christ, St. John the Baptist, "That there went out to him all the country of Judea, and all they of Jerusalem, and were baptized by him in the river Jordan, *confessing their sins.*" (Mark 1: 5.)

Q. But did not this confession merely mean confessing sin to God?

A. Protestants must be blind indeed, not to see the absurdity of this subterfuge; do they consider that a culprit, about to be hanged, makes a real confession, if he merely confess his sin in his own mind or heart to God? No, every execution that takes place proves that he does not. Confession is the revelation of sin to man. The confession of sin to God is in itself, without contrition, a matter of little consequence; for God *knows* all things; we confess to him in spite of ourselves. Besides, in Num. 5, you see that the confession must have been to men, as the *restitution of the principal, and the fifth part over and above*, must have been made to men.

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What do all the words of Scripture just quoted by the Doctrinal Catechism mean?

A. Just such confession as was practised among the first Christians and is among Protestants now. There is not a word of its being *secret* or *to a priest*.

Q. What makes it *certain* that the *confession* mentioned in those words of Scripture was not such confession as that of the Roman Church?

A. *That* is said to be "a *sacrament, ordained by Christ himself.*" Therefore this confession, *which was all before the coming of our Lord, was of some other kind.*

Q. But the Doctrinal Catechism says that confession to God is AN "ABSURDITY"—that "confession is the revelation of sin *to man*"—that the "confession of sin *to God* is in itself, without contrition, a matter of little consequence; for God knows all things: we confess to him in spite of ourselves," etc.?

A. Yes, it says so. On the other hand the word of God, while it says nothing of *secret confession to a priest*, has many such sentences as this: "*Make confession unto THE LORD GOD.*"* The confession "*to God* without contrition, is of *little consequence*" ? We say, of *no* consequence, that *it is no confession* at all. Then the Roman Church must mean that confession to a priest, *even without contrition*, is of *no little consequence* ! We need not confess to God, *because he "knows all things"* ! and this when God commands us to make confession to him ! *This is the infidel's argument* AGAINST ALL PRAYER. You who read this now notice well how the words and the authority of God are treated here.

CHAP. III.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. In the New Law, is confession instituted by God or by the Church ?

A. Confession is a divine institution, but the Church has fixed the time for the performance of that duty.

Q. How do you prove that confession is a divine institution ?

A. From John 20 : 22, where Christ says to his Apostles, "Whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven them ; and whose sins ye shall retain, they are retained ;" and from Matt. chap. 18.

Q. What do you conclude from these passages ?

A. That before the pastors of the Church can exercise this power, the sinner must confess his sins to them.

Q. Why so ?

A. By the above text, the priest has power to forgive or to retain sin, according to the disposition of the penitent ; now, without confession, the exercise of this power is impossible, because, in that case, the priest can not know what sins to retain, or what to forgive.

* Ezra 10 : 11 : "Make confession to the Lord, the God of your fathers."—Douay Bible.

Q. Throw a little more light on this?

A. The priest is a judge who must decide what sins he ought to forgive, what he ought to retain: now, no judge can pronounce a decision without hearing the whole case.

Q. May it not be said, that the priest is not a judge, but is appointed merely *to declare the sins forgiven*?

A. No; for the keys are given, to open and shut the gate, not to *declare that it is open*. Hence, the power which Christ gave to his Apostles and their successors, was the power of *binding and loosing*, not the power of *declaring* the penitent *bound or loosed*.

Q. What do you find in 1 John 1 : 8?

A. "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins."

Q. May not Protestants say, that this saying, *we have no sin*, and this confession of our sins, merely regard God, and not the priests?

A. They must regard the priests; for who would dare to say to God that he has no sin? And does not God know all our sins already, without having recourse to our confession?

Q. Have you any other remark to make on this passage?

A. It says, if we confess our sins, God is *faithful and just* to forgive us. God is here said to be faithful and just, because he *promised* to forgive us our sins on the condition that we confess them. The words of the Apostle are the same as the following: "If we confess our sins, God, who is faithful and just, will keep the promise he made in these words: Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven."

Q. Can you produce any other texts of Scripture on this subject?

A. St. James 5 : 16, says: "*Confess, therefore, your sins one to another, and pray for one another, that you may be saved.*" Here we have *confession to man* laid down as a *condition to salvation*.

Q. May not this mean public and general confession, not to the priest, but to any neighbor?

A. It means *confession of sin*, either public or private, for *either* will be sufficient, and it means to the pastors

of the Church who are declared to have *power to absolve*; for, what would be the use of confessing private sins to the public, who can not forgive them, and who would be scandalized by them? Besides, who would confess to those who might divulge his sins, and destroy his character?

CHAP. III.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. When were repentance and confession of sin first commanded?

A. From the very first sin of Adam, as they become the duty of any one who does sin. They are necessary to that true faith in God's mercy, through which alone we can be justified and saved. They are mentioned and commanded in all parts of the Holy Scripture; and for them no man needs the help of a fellow-creature, but can call upon God in his secret prayers.

Q. Does the Doctrinal Catechism prove to you from the Scripture, that you ought to quit this ancient, simple, and spiritual confession, to go and make yours to a Roman priest?

A. No: I ask for some plain words which command this; and I am only told again of what our Lord said to the disciples, (John 20 and Matt. 18,) in which, as we have already seen, there is not a word about *priests* or *confession*, and which fairly mean something else. So, the Doctrinal Catechism argues, that priests must be *judges* of other men's sins—and, to judge them must know them—and, to know them, must have all secretly confessed to them. I find nothing in Scripture of any men's being the judges of others' sins, except such words as these, "*Judge not that ye be not judged*;"* and "Who art thou that judgest another?"† "*He that judgeth me is THE LORD*,"‡ etc., etc.

Q. What of the words of St. John, 1st Epistle 1: 9?

A. I am willing simply to repeat them, and let any one see for himself whether they command Roman "penance and confession:" "If we confess our sins,

* Matt. 7: 1: "Judge not that you may not be judged."—Douay Bible.

† Jas. 4: 12: "But who art thou who judgest thy neighbor?"—Ib.

‡ 1 Cor. 4: 4. So the Douay Bible.

he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.”*

Q. What of the words of St. James 5 : 16 ?

A. We receive, *them*, too, with all our hearts : “ Confess your sins one to another, and pray for one another.” Christian friends may well confide in one another, and help one another with advice and prayers when these are asked. But this does not mean that I can never have my sins forgiven unless I confess them to a priest. Notice—“*one to another.*” If I do this, will the priest, in his turn, kneel down and confess all his evil acts and thoughts to me, and have *me* say to *him*, “I absolve thee” ?

CHAP. IV.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Is there any example in Scripture to prove that the first Christians confessed their sins ?

A. Yes ; the 19th chapter of the Acts tells us, that many who believed came, “*confessing and showing their deeds.*”

Q. What did the Apostles require of them besides confession ?

A. “That many of them who had followed curious arts,” should bring their books together and burn them.

What do you infer from this passage ?

A. That St. Paul and the converts of Ephesus were thoroughly Catholics in this matter, seeing that they did exactly what the pastors of the Catholic Church and their people do at the present day, in the same circumstances.

Q. Is it clear, from the Fathers of the Ancient Church, that private confession was always practised ?

A. Yes ; St. Cyprian, in his Sermon, (de Lapsis,) says : “My dear brethren, let every one, whilst he is yet in life, and in a state to profit by the advice and assistance of the priest, confess his sins.” St. Basil (in Quæst. Brev. Reg. 228, 229) remarks : “Our sins must

* “If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all iniquity.”—Douay Bible.

necessarily be confessed to those to whom has been committed the dispensation of the mysteries of God."

Q. What are St. Ambrose's words? (Lib. ii. de Pœnit. chap. 6.)

A. "If you obtain grace, confess your sins, for an humble confession bursts all the chains of sin."

Q. What says St. Chrysostom? Lib. iii. de Sacerd.

A. "The Jewish priests could not cure the leprosy of the body, they merely declared it cured; but the Christian priest does not merely declare, but effects the cure of the leprosy of the soul."

Q. What says St. Augustine? Hom. xlix. t. 10.

A. "Let no one say, I sin secretly; I do it before God, he knows my heart and will pardon me. Did Christ then say without reason: 'What you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed in heaven'? Were the keys, then, given to the Church for no purpose?" See also St. Jerome, Expos. in Ezech. cap. 10.

Q. Why did the Lutherans abolish confession?

A. Because, says the Confession of Augsburg, "no man *can* remember all his sins."

Q. Is this a good and valid reason?

A. Certainly not; since the Catholic Church only requires, that her children be sorry for *all* their sins, and confess all that, after earnest and careful examination of conscience, they can bring to their recollection.

Q. Was the above the real reason why Protestants abandoned confession?

A. No; they abolished it, first, because it was troublesome, and they did not wish to carry their cross; secondly, because their pastors were not lawfully ordained and commissioned priests, and hence, as they had not the power to absolve, confession to them was useless; thirdly, the thing which they called the Reformed Church taught them, that faith alone was quite sufficient to save them—hence, it was useless to practise confession or any other Scriptural precept; fourthly, these ministers were bound by no law to keep secret the sins confessed to them—hence, their people would be fools to put any thing in their power.

Q. Does the Church of England teach any thing on this subject?

A. Yes; the Book of Common Prayer teaches both confession and the power of absolving; and even the Kirk of Scotland, (see Confess. of Faith, Visit. of Sick,) whose ministers have certainly no ordination, would willingly lead their people to confess. But these spurious Churches have never succeeded in this attempt.

CHAP. IV.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What is the one instance of confession mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles?

A. It is this, (in the account of St. Paul's preaching at Ephesus :) "And many that believed came and confessed, and showed their evil deeds. Many, also, of them which used curious arts, brought their books together and burned them before all men."* It seems that some of the converts had led such openly wicked lives, that they thought it their duty to make a public confession of this. Some also burned their false books of magic "*before all*." There is nothing in this of *secret* confession, or of doing any thing "because the Apostles required it," as a Roman priest would impose a penance. What they did was their own free act, showing real penitence. Notice, too, that it was only "*some* of the converts," and *not all*, as the Roman confession requires.

Q. When was the Roman confession fully established in that Church?

A. Not until more than one thousand years after the Apostles. The superstitious awe of the clergy, which began very early to creep over the Church, prepared the way for it. When it began to be practised, it was naturally favored by the clergy themselves, on account of the honor and power which it gave them, and was, after a while, easily received by the people at large, instead of the severe *public* discipline which had been

* Acts 19 : 18, 19 : "And many of those who believed came confessing and declaring their deeds. And many of those who had followed curious things, brought their books together and burned them before all."—Douay Bible.

usual before. Thus, though a general practice for some time, it was not made the positive universal *law* until the 4th Lateran Council (1215) made this decree and canon: "Every believer of either sex, after coming to years of discretion shall faithfully confess all his sins alone, *at least once a year*, to his own priest, and shall endeavor to the utmost of his power, to fulfill the penance enjoined, receiving reverently, at least at Easter, the Sacrament of the Eucharist, unless, perhaps, through the counsel of his own priest, for some reasonable cause he should conclude to abstain at that time from its reception. Otherwise, let him be prohibited from entering the Church while living, and dying, be deprived of Christian burial."*

Q. What shall we say of the words of "the Fathers," quoted by the Doctrinal Catechism?

A. What *Basil* says is taken, as we have already seen, from some rules which that pious, but austere, and somewhat superstitious man, made for a society of monks which he formed three hundred years after the Apostles, and has no reference to the general practice of the Church. *Cyprian* means confession secretly to God, or openly in the Church, the pastor giving only his *advice*. This and the *public* sentence of the pastors in discipline is what Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Augustine plainly mean, (see page 295.) Do we need any more proof of this? Well, then, let what follows be decisive. "Tell me wherefore thou art ashamed and blushest to confess thy sins? *Thou tellest them not to a man*, that he should rebuke thee, nor *confessest them to a fellow-servant*, that he should make them known. Thou discoverest thy wound to him who careth for thee, the merciful Lord, the Physician. He desireth that thou shouldst *confess them to Him*; not that he should punish, but that he should pardon thee; not that he, the all-seeing One, should *know* them, but that thou mayest know how great a debt he forgiveth thee." (CHRYSOSTOM.)† "What have I to do with men, that *they should hear my confessions*, as if they

* Carranza. Sum. Conc. Gen. i. 301.

† Conc. de Laz. iv. 4.

were going to heal all my infirmities.” (AUGUSTINE.)* On the other hand, we challenge any one to produce a line from any of these Fathers to the effect, that any one in order to obtain forgiveness of his sins is to make confession of them to a priest, who can then, “*representing the character, and discharging the functions of Jesus Christ,*” FORGIVE them.

Q. It is plain, then, that the Roman law of “Confession” is more than God has ever commanded or the Church practised at first; but is it a *harmless* or a *dangerous* mistake?

A. Very dangerous. It compels the Christian to perform a degrading homage to a fellow-creature; it rudely lays bare all the delicate secrets of the soul to the eye of another, and thus wounds modesty; it gives this man a terrible power over all who confess to him; it tempts him to use this power for all sorts of filthiness and cruelty: it prevents *his being ever detected* in such evil deeds, by *the law of secrecy on the part of penitent as well as priest*; it makes this man profanely mimic the person and power of our most glorious Lord, Jesus Christ; it leads men to trust in part, at least, to their “penances” for the atonement of their sins, thus neglecting the precious, sufficient and only merits of our Lord’s passion and death for us; and it makes sin seem so light a matter—when a few minutes’ talk with a priest, and his words, “I absolve thee,” can wash it all away—that men are less afraid to break the laws of God.

Q. Has this in fact done great harm?

A. Yes, it has been one chief cause that in some countries *the very ministers of religion* are the most scandalously vicious order of men; while most of the people think that they are very good Christians because they sometimes “go to confession,” though they never in *secret prayers* humble themselves before God, and implore him to forgive them, and to purify their hearts. So, when they are about to die, their only thought is to have some one “*run for a priest.*”†

* Confess. x., c. 3.

† The proofs of the shocking facts mentioned in the preceding answer, are so various and numerous, that one could not, and I may well say, *need* not refer to them all. See, however, for this, Michelet on Confession, p. 000, etc. Also those standard books in which priests

Q. What was the conduct of the Reformed and Roman Churches in regard to the practice, as they found it, prevailing three hundred and fifty years ago?

A. The former abolished the slavish and dangerous usage, while the latter retains it to this day.



On Extreme Unction.

DOCTRINAL CATECHISM.

Q. Where does the Scripture mention the sacrament of Extreme Unction?

A. In James 5 : 14 : "Is any one sick among you, let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him."

Q. What do you conclude from these words?

A. That, according to Scripture, every Christian in danger of death should be anointed by the priests of the Church.

Q. What would you say to a Protestant touching these words of St. James?

A. You boast, I would say, eternally about following the Scripture, to the letter, in every thing; how is it, then, that you never anoint one of your sick, whilst you are aware that there is an express command in the Scripture to this effect?

are instructed how to hear confessions, and to ask questions of those who confess—Peter Dens' Moral Theol.; Alph. Liguori, ib. etc. You will see that these questions of the priest, teach indecency and lewdness to those who might otherwise escape them. At one time many murderous affrays occurred among the Irish soldiers of a regiment stationed at Malta. At last the colonel devised this remedy: On the next occurrence of the kind, after the murderer had been condemned by the court-martial, and was about to be led to execution, he asked as usual for a priest. "No," said the commandant, "you sent that man out of the world without a priest, and you shall follow him so." Whereupon he was hanged at once. *No more murders occurred in the regiment.*

Q. May not Protestants say, that this passage of St. James is to be understood of a miraculous unction, like that in St. Mark 6 : 13 : "And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them" ?

A. No ; this passage is rather a confirmation of our doctrine ; for the Apostles, through the sacraments, often wrought miracles, as in the 19th chap. of the Acts, St. Paul works miracles through Confirmation. These miracles were not an essential part of the sacraments administered—they were an extraordinary exhibition of God's power to induce an unbelieving world to admit, not only the sacraments so miraculously established, but to admit also the truth of Christianity. When, however, the world was converted, these wonderful accompaniments of the sacraments were no longer necessary.

Q. Have you any other reply to make on this matter ?

A. Yes ; the words of St. James are so clear, that it is impossible to explain them away. By these words, *all priests* are ordered to anoint ; from St. Mark this does not appear : 2dly, By the words of St. James *all the sick* are to be anointed ; from St. Mark it is only clear that *many* were anointed : 3dly, This duty of anointing the sick is, by St. James, expressly confined to the priest ; whilst the gift of healing maladies and sicknesses, in St. Mark, is given to others, as well as to the pastors of the Church : Finally, the unction mentioned by St. James, is to produce the effect of saving by the remission of sin, which proves it evidently to be an institution of Jesus Christ ; for only he, by a material mean, can produce such an effect. Now, such effects are not at all attributed to the unction mentioned by St. Mark.

Q. Does not the word Presbyter mean Elder in the above passage ?

A. Certainly not in the Protestant sense. The pastors of the Church were, in the primitive ages, called Presbyters ; because they were generally elderly men ; such things as Kirk elders (anomalous beings, who are neither ecclesiastics nor laymen) were unknown in the Church, until Protestantism made its appearance. But

what sets the matter at rest, is the circumstance, that the Apostles are called Presbyters in 1 Peter 5 : 1 ; in 2 John 1 : 1 ; and in 3 John 1 : 1.

Q. Is Extreme Unction a sacrament ?

A. Clearly ; because it is a visible sign, which, by divine institution, confers invisible grace.

Q. What is the sensible sign ?

A. The anointing with holy oil, accompanied by prayer : "Let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord."—James 5.

Q. What is the invisible grace given ?

A. The sanctifying grace of God, by which sin is washed away and forgiven ; the actual grace of God, by which the soul is strengthened, and sometimes the restoration of the body to health, according to these words : "And the prayer of faith shall *save the sick man*, and the Lord shall *raise him up*, and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him."

Q. How do you show that Christ instituted this sacrament ?

A. Protestants must be very ignorant to ask this question. They believe St. James to be an inspired Apostle ; and can they for a moment imagine, that such a man would even speak of a rite, by which man is to be *saved, raised up*, and *forgiven his sins*, unless as an Apostle, taught by the Redeemer himself, he had the express institution and authority of his Divine Master ?

Q. Do the Fathers mention this sacrament in their writings ?

A. St. Augustine, Serm. 215 de Temp., says : "As often as sickness happens, the sick man should receive the Eucharistical sacrament, and then the unction of his body, in order to comply with the words of the Apostle James, chap. 5 : '*Is any sick amongst you,*'" etc.

Q. Did the Church of England ever use this rite ?

A. Yes ; in the first Liturgy of Edward the Sixth, the use of Chrism and Extreme Unction is ordered. (See order for Visit. of Sick, page 114.)

On Extreme Unction.

THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What is "Extreme Unction," as practised in the Roman Church?

A. It is "the sacrament of dying persons," (Cat. Counc. Trent, p. 206,) in which, when the sick are thought to be near death, a priest is sent for to touch their eyes, nose, mouth, ears, hands, feet, etc., with oil, saying over some Latin words. All this is supposed to make death itself easier, and the soul more safe in the other life.

Q. Was any thing like this "ordained by Christ himself," that is, in his own person and words, so as to be a sacrament?

A. This, as all admit, is not said any where in the Holy Scriptures.

Q. Does the Roman Church profess to find "Extreme Unction" commanded at all in the word of God?

A. Yes; in one place, where it is said: "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders (presbyters or priests) of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall *save the sick* and *the Lord shall raise him up*, and if he have committed sins they shall be forgiven him."*

Q. Does this describe the "Extreme Unction" of the Roman Church?

A. Not at all. St. James advises this *in every case of sickness*. "Extreme Unction" is only for the dying. The one was *promised* to be followed by the restoring of health: in the other this is never even thought of; for "Extreme Unction" is used only *because* and *when* all hope of cure is given up.

* James 5 : 14, 15. You have already had the Douay translation as quoted by the Doctrinal Catechism, p. 306.

Q. Can it be said that the *cure of the sick* was a MIRACLE which only *sometimes accompanied* what St. James speaks of?

A. It is plain from the Apostle's words that this miraculous cure was *the very object* of the ceremony. Does the Roman Church teach that the dying man could not *have his sins forgiven* without this? What then is its "sacrament of Confession" and the absolution of the priest good for?

Q. Was this anointing of the sick meant to be used always in the Church?

A. As it was to be always followed by a miracle, we have reason to think that when the need and the age of miracles had passed away, this ceremony would also properly cease. But, however this may be, to turn it into an unction of dying persons with the notion that this will help them and save them in the world to come, is mere superstition.

Q. Was any such thing in use among the first Christians?

A. There is *no trace of it whatever* for more than three hundred years after the Apostles. We have full accounts of the dying hours of some of them, but nothing is said of their receiving "Extreme Unction." There is mention (as in what is quoted by the Doctrinal Catechism from Augustine) of the anointing of sick persons and *their being cured by it*, but nothing of a "sacrament of the dying." *These very words of Augustine* are fatal to the Roman notion. Notice: "*As often as sickness happens,*" etc. Afterwards, as the Dark Ages drew on, this *was* turned into the "sacrament of Extreme Unction."

Q. Did the Reformed Church of England ever use an Anointing of the Sick?

A. Yes, they had at first a simple form for this, according to the words of St. James, which perhaps might well enough have been retained. This, however, was afterward omitted from the Book of Common Prayer, it being thought that the usage had properly passed away with the age of miracles.

On Holy Orders.

DOCTRINAL CATECHISM.

Q. Who sends the pastors of the Church ?

A. Christ himself sent the first pastors, in these words : " Going, therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them," etc. These first pastors, aided by the Spirit of God in making their selection, appointed their successors ; and thus, through the chief bishop of the Church, the body of pastors have continued down to the present day.

Q. May not any man set himself up for a Christian teacher, if he be chosen by the people, as the Presbyterian ministers are ?

A. Certainly not ; since St. Paul says, Heb. 5 : 4 : " Neither doth any man take the honor to himself, but he that is *called* (not by the mob, but) *by God as Aaron was.*" " How can they preach," says St. Paul again, Rom. 10 : 15, " unless they be sent ?"

Q. Have you any other texts on this subject ?

A. In St. John, chap. 10, Christ says : " For he that entereth not by the sheepfold, but climbeth up another way, the same is a thief and a robber." Again, Matt. 15 : 14, those who intrude themselves into the pastoral office, are represented as " blind leaders of the blind," who, with their unfortunate followers, will " fall into the pit."

Q. What are the principal duties of the pastors of the Church ?

A. To preach the Gospel, Matt. 28 : 19 ; to baptize, Matt. 28 : 19 ; to offer up the holy sacrifice of the Eucharist, Luke 22 : 19 ; to forgive sins by the power with which God has invested them, John 20 : 22 ; and to administer the holy sacraments of which we are now treating. (See texts quoted, as regards each sacrament.)

Q. Did the Apostles communicate their sacred powers to those who succeeded them ?

A. This is clear from the words of Christ, who said

he would be with them all days, even to the consummation of the world. Now, he could not be with the Apostles all days, as the pastors of his Church; therefore, he meant that he would be with them and their successors all days, even to the end. Besides, we hear St. Paul, Acts 20 : 28, address the chief pastors who were to succeed him in these words: "Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost has placed you bishops to rule the Church of God." In fine, the religion of Christ was to be the religion of all time; therefore, of necessity, it must have, at all times, pastors ordained and sent as the Apostles were.

Q. Are bishops superior to priests in authority and jurisdiction?

A. Certainly; as much superior to the priests as the Apostles were to the other disciples. When Judas fell from the Apostleship, the other Apostles elected and raised Matthias to his place, according to that prophecy, "His bishopric let another take." (Acts 1 : 16-24.) St. Paul, Acts 20 : 28, says, the bishops are to rule the Church of God. In 1 Tim. 5 : 19, he says, "Against a priest receive not an accusation, but under two or three witnesses;" from which the superiority of bishops is more than evident, as they are here constituted the JUDGES of the priesthood.

Q. Where, in the sacrament of holy orders, have we the outward sign?

A. In the imposition of the bishop's hands, the delivery of the necessary instruments, and prayer. Read the ordination of the seven Deacons, Acts 6 : 6; and that of SS. Paul and Barnabas, Acts 13 : 3.

Q. Where does it appear that inward grace is conferred in this sacrament?

A. In 1 Tim, 4 : 14, where St. Paul says to Timothy: "Neglect not the *grace* that is in thee, which was *given thee by prophecy, by the imposition of the hands of the priesthood*; and in 2 Tim. 1 : 6: "Stir up the *grace of God* which is in thee *by the imposition of my hands.*"

Q. Who has the power to ordain priests?

A. None but bishops.

Q. How do you prove this?

A. From Titus 1 : 5, where St. Paul says to Titus, bishop of Crete: "For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and shouldst *ordain priests in every city, as I also appointed thee*;" and from 1 Tim. 5 : 22, where St. Paul tells that bishop of Ephesus "not to impose hands lightly on any man."

Q. Can you establish the superiority of bishops from tradition?

A. Very clearly; from the very establishment of Christianity down to the time of Luther, we defy any adversary to name even one person considered a priest, who was not ordained by some bishop.

Q. What do the Fathers say?

A. St. Ignatius, a disciple of the Apostles, who succeeded St. Peter in the See of Antioch, says, Epist. ad Trall.: "Reverence your bishop as Christ himself, like as the blessed Apostles have commanded us; for who is the bishop, but he who has all power and principality over all?" Again, Ep. ad Magnes: "It becomes you to obey your bishop, and in nothing to resist him, . . . whether you be priest, deacon, or laic." St. Cyprian, Ep. 55, says: "Heresies and schisms rise from no other source, but disobedience to the chief pastors." Tertullian, Lib. de Bap. cap. 17, writes: "The bishop, indeed, has a right to give baptism, and next the priests and deacons, but not without the authority of the bishops."

Q. What says St. Epiphanius—Con. Acrius?

A. That the 65 Heresy, condemned by the Church, consisted in maintaining, as Acrius had done, that the powers of the bishop and the priest were equal. He adds, that there is this difference between the bishops and priests, that the priests are the spiritual fathers of the people by baptism, whilst the bishops are the spiritual fathers of the priests by ordination.

Q. What was done at the Council of Alexandria?

A. All the ordinations of Colluthus were declared null, because he was only a priest.

Q. What do you conclude from all this?

A. That none but Catholics have true and real priests or pastors ; because, in other Churches, the ministers are not ordained at all, or ordained by men whose Episcopal ordination is doubtful ; hence, I conclude also, that sectarians are deprived of the greater part of the sacraments—their ministry is not of divine appointment but self-constituted, and their Church forms no part of the Church of Christ. “Where there is no Episcopal ordination,” says the Protestant Dodwell, “there is no ministry, no sacrament, no Church.”

On Holy Orders.

THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. By whom was the Church governed and taught in the days of the Apostles ?

A. By three orders of ministers ; 1st, the Apostles, who had the general oversight of all ; 2d, Elders, or Presbyters ;* and, 3d, Deacons. The private members of the Church, or *laity*, had also a vote in regard to many matters.

Q. How was it next after the age of the Apostles ?

A. The same as before, the Apostles being succeeded in the chief oversight of the Church (though not in their inspiration and power of miracles) by an order of chief pastors called bishops, (or overseers.)

Q. Is it the positive law of our Lord that there should be always these three orders of ministers in the Church ?

A. We can not say this, because it is not so expressly declared in the Holy Scriptures ; yet surely it must be a plain case of *necessity* which would make it proper to change this first government of the Church.

Q. Has that government been continued since the days of the Apostles ?

A. Yes ; there have always been in almost the whole Church these three orders of ministers, the succession

* *Priest*, in our language is a contraction of this word.

of them having gone on unbroken. These pastors have been chosen from among the people, and solemnly set apart or *ordained* to their office by the bishops, to whom this duty always belonged.

Q. In what case can you suppose that it would be right to continue the succession of pastors even without the ordaining of a bishop?

A. When no bishop could be found but what was so given to false doctrine that he would not ordain any one who would teach the pure word of God. Then presbyters, or deacons, or even the private brethren of a church, might ordain pastors rather than that the succession of them should cease. For if either the *form* or the *substance* of the Church must fail, it should surely be the former.

Q. Has this necessity in fact ever arisen?

A. We have reason to think that it did in some of the Reformed Churches, in countries where, at the blessed Reformation, all the bishops adhered to the false doctrines of the Popes.

Q. Are the words of St. Paul, "No man taketh," etc., (see p. 311,) contrary to this?

A. These words are only spoken of a man's being made high priest of the Jews. Yet, if we apply them to the Christian ministry, this ordination, without a bishop, when necessary, would be as much in the name and by the authority of our Lord as the other.

Q. Is it right when ministers of our Lord and King are chosen from and by the private members of the Church, (as was the case among the first Christians,) by whomsoever they are *ordained*, to say that they are "*called by the MOB*"?

A. It is reviling the people of God, with whom "there is no respect of persons" among his "royal priesthood," his children in this world.

Q. Are all pastors, except those who have been ordained by Roman bishops, described by our Lord as "blind leaders of the blind"?

A. No; he thus calls some who, he says, "sit in Moses' seat," that is, seem to be the "successors" of God's own very great prophet. This well describes in these days the Roman clergy, who, while claiming to derive their office from the holy Apostles, lead the people away from the *religion* of the Apostles.

Q. What was the test given by our Lord to his people—for detecting *false teachers*—that they would not be ordained by Roman bishops?

A. No; never any thing of the kind; but this: “Ye shall know them *by their fruits*.”*

Q. Has the *Protestant Episcopal Church* of America lost the direct succession of bishops through the false doctrine of bishops in the days of the Reformation?

A. No. The Bishops of England *joined in* the Reformation, and so continued the ancient government of the Church as well as restored the pure doctrine; all of which *we have received from them*.

Q. Is it not to be wished that all Churches should again agree in this old Apostolic government?

A. Yes; and we will heartily hope and pray for this. But we give our Lord most joyful thanks that he has united all the Reformed Churches in the preaching of a pure Gospel, even when some of them lack that wise and sacred *form* of the Church in which it was first set up.

Q. Is ordination (or Holy Orders) a “sacrament”?

A. Plainly not, in the strict sense of the word; for, unlike Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, it is not meant for *all members of the Church*, but only for a few of them. Then, too, there is no material substance (like the water of Baptism or the bread and wine of the Eucharist) used as an “outward and visible sign” (or sacrament) of what is inward and spiritual.



On Matrimony.

CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Has marriage all the necessary constituents of a sacrament?

A. It has the outward sign, in the mutual consent of the parties, externally signified; accompanied by the other conditions which the ecclesiastical law requires.

* Matt. 7 : 16 : “By their fruits you shall know them.”—Douay Bible.

The inward grace is that which enables the married couple to discharge their duties faithfully and in a Christian manner to one another, and to train up their children in the fear of God ; and the divine institution is evident from Matt. 19 : 6, where it is said : “ Wherefore, they are no more two, but one flesh ; what therefore *God hath joined together* let no man put asunder.”

Q. How does it appear that grace is conferred in the sacrament of marriage ?

A. In the first place, you see from Matt. 19, quoted above, that God is the author of marriage, and surely you will admit, that he will give to those whom he joins in this holy union, such graces as will enable them to discharge the duties of it. 2dly, St. Paul expressly says, Ephes. 5 : 32, “ This is a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church ; ” that is, that marriage is, in the New Law of Christ and in his Church, a great sacrament ; for the passage would not make sense, if this be not its meaning ; what, if marriage be not the great sacrament here alluded to—what is this great sacrament in Christ and the Church ?—Christ himself and his Church can not be a great sacrament *in Christ and the Church* ; but if marriage be this great sacrament, then every sacrament confers grace.

Q. What does St. Paul say, in the preceding verses, 24 and 25, of same chapter ?

A. “ Therefore, as the Church is subject to Christ, so also let the wives be to husbands in all things. Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church and gave himself up for it, that he might sanctify it.” Here the union of man and wife is likened to the union of Christ and the Church ; but the union of Christ and the Church is not only a union of love, but also of grace ; therefore, such also is the union of man and wife.

Q. Do not Protestants translate the above word “ sacrament ” by “ mystery,” in Ephes. 5 : 32 ?

A. Yes ; but they had an object in doing so ; they wished to deny the sacrament of marriage ; and to show them that they have made nonsense of the text, you have only to ask them, what *mystery* there is in

marriage, if it be not a *sacrament*? and, if not a sacrament, how is it *greater* “in Christ and the Church,” than it was at any former period of the world? St. Augustine reads *sacrament*; and St. Jerome, who *restored the New Testament to the truth of the Greek, and the Old, to the truth of the Hebrew*, who lived fourteen hundred years ago, and who was one of the greatest linguists of that or any other age, this St. Jerome reads “*sacrament*” for “mystery.”

Q. What does St. Augustine say as to the sacrament of Matrimony—De Bono Conjug. cap. 18, t. vi. p. 335; Ibid. c. xxiv. p. 337, and c. x. de Nupt.?

A. He says, “In the marriage of our women, the *sanctity of the sacrament* is of the greatest weight;” and again, “In all nations, the great good of marriage consists in the propagation of children and the fidelity of the parties; but *among Christians, there is, besides, the HOLINESS OF THE SACRAMENT.*” Tertullian also, in his Treatise de Monog., expressly calls matrimony a *sacrament*. St. Ireneus, Adv. Hæres. lib. i. cap 1, says: “By all means they ought to *meditate on the sacrament of marriage.*” St. Cyril adds, cap. 2, in Joan. 22: “Christ sanctified wedlock, and gave grace to marriage.” St. Ambrose, Lib. i. de Abraham, and in cap. 5 ad Ephes., writes: “There is a great *sacrament in the union of man and wife.*”

Q. Are all Christians bound to marry by the command of God?

A. Certainly not; for if they were, St. Paul has given a very bad advice.

Q. Repeat his words, 1 Cor. 7: 8.

A. “But I say to the unmarried and to the widows, it is good for them *if they so continue even as I.*”

Q. Does not the Apostle say, in same chapter, verse 2, “But for fear of fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband”?

A. Yes; but in verse 1st, he says, “It is good for a man not to touch a woman;” and in verse 9th: “But if they do not contain themselves, let them marry.” Hence, the Apostle’s meaning evidently is, that those who do not feel, that, with the help of God’s grace, they can live chaste lives, ought to marry, and that

once married, each man should confine himself to his *own* wife, and each wife to her *own* husband. Indeed, in same chapter, verse 27, St. Paul says, "Art thou loosed from a wife, *seek not a wife*;" and, in several passages, he exhorts all who are able, to live, like himself, a single life. (See chap. 7, verse 7.)

Q. Does not God order Adam and Eve, and the whole human race, in Genesis, to increase and multiply?

A. This is not a command to all, but a blessing by which God accords fecundity to all that shall marry. Those Protestants who understand it as a command, must charge St. Paul, one of God's inspired Apostles, with breaking the law of God. With what face can Protestants bring forward such nonsense, seeing that a great number of themselves never marry; and what will they do with those who can not get married?

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Is marriage a sacrament?

A. It is a *sacred thing*, and most properly solemnized by Christians with the authority of the Church; but it is not a *sacrament* in the strict sense, because, 1st, it was not ordained by Christ himself as peculiar to his Church, but had existed from the beginning of the world even before the fall of man; nor, 2dly, is it like Baptism and the Lord's Supper necessary to being a member of the Church.

Q. But we are told that St. Paul calls it a sacrament in Eph. 5 : 32 ? (See p. 317.)

A. The word "sacrament" is of no importance, and is here a mere matter of *translation*. The Greek word so rendered by the Roman Church, is "*mysterion*," and we translate it "mystery," "this is a great *mystery*," etc., that is, "the way in which the relation of Christ to the Church resembles that of a man to his wife is a great mystery." The Roman Church *in all other places* translates this same Greek word "*mystery*," as we do. (Rom. 1 : 25 ; 1 Tim. 3 : 9, etc., etc.) The

whole sense of St. Paul's words here (read them for yourself, v. 22-33) shows that if he meant to call marriage a *sacrament* at all, it could only be in the wide meaning of a *sacred thing*. The awkward contrivance of reading, "I speak *in* Christ and the Church," instead of, "*concerning* Christ," etc., can not help the Roman doctrine.

Q. What then do Jerome, Augustine, etc., mean when they speak of "the sacrament of marriage"?

A. The same as when they call *preaching* etc., sacraments. (See p. 230.)

Q. What is there remarkable in the doctrine of the Roman Church about this?

A. That while it calls marriage a *sacrament*, and so a "means of holiness," it not only does not enjoin it upon all, but even absolutely *forbids* it to those who ought to be the holiest of all, that is, the ministers of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that with the notion that this *means of grace* would POLLUTE them!

Q. Did St. Paul say any thing as absurd as this?

A. No; he neither calls marriage a "means of holiness," nor on the other hand denounces it as unsafe and unholy. On the contrary, he says that it is the safe and natural state of life for all men and women. "*Marriage is honorable in ALL.*"* "*I would therefore that the younger women marry,*" etc.† Still he recommends to the Christians of *Corinth* in those dangerous times of persecution to remain single as he did.

CHAP. II.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Does the Catholic Church forbid any one to marry?

A. No, she leaves every one at liberty to do as he thinks proper.

* Heb. 13 : 4 : "Marriage honorable in all."—Douay Bible.

† 1 Tim. 5 : 14 : "I will, therefore, that the younger shall marry."—Douay Bible.

Q. Does she not forbid the marriage of priests ?

A. She forbids priests to marry, but she obliges no one to become a priest.

Q. To what does she oblige those who enter into Holy Orders ?

A. To keep the vow of chastity, which they have *voluntarily*, and after mature deliberation, made to God.

Q. Why does she oblige them to this ?

A. That they may be more at liberty to discharge their duties to their flock, and that they may be totally disengaged from temporal matters. These advantages of the unmarried priest over the married Protestant minister, were acknowledged, even by Protestants, during the prevalence of that terrible pestilence, the cholera, and are still openly visible to all, when typhus fever and other contagious diseases scourge our population.

Q. Does St. Paul clearly urge these advantages in 1 Cor., chap. 7 : 32 ?

A. Yes ; he says : “ But I would have you without *solicitude* : he that is *without a wife* is *solicitous* for the *things that belong to the Lord*, how he may *please God* ; but he that *is with a wife* is *solicitous* for the *things of the world*, how he may *please his wife*, and he is *divided*.” (Read also verse 34.)

Q. In any of the early ages of the Church, were bishops or priests permitted to marry after entering into holy orders ?

A. No ; we defy our adversaries to name even one such case.

Q. What are the words of the Second Canon of the 2d Council of Carthage ?

A. “ That bishops, priests, and all who are charged with the administration of the sacraments, must lead *continent lives*.”

Q. What reason does the Council give for this ordinance ?

A. “ This,” adds the Council, “ was taught by the Apostles, and has been *always practised* by the Church.”

Q. What do you infer from all that has been said on this subject ?

A. That reason, antiquity, and Scripture, are all on the side of Catholic doctrine and practice.

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Which does the word of God say is the more safe, a married or a single life; and why?

A. The married; because it exposes us less to fall into those sins which defile man most in soul and body, and so dishonor our Lord. (See 1 Cor. 7 : 2-9.)

Q. What men, of all, ought to expose themselves least to these dangers?

A. The pastors of the Church.

Q. What men does the Roman Church forbid to marry?

A. These very pastors.

Q. Is there any such law given in the Holy Scriptures?

A. No; on the contrary, these tell us that St. Peter and St. Philip were married, (Matt. 8 : 14 and Acts 21 : 9,)* and say of every minister, whether bishop, priest, or deacon, that he must be "the husband of one wife." (1 Tim. 3, and Tit. 1 : 6.) St. Paul, also, speaking of *his* single life, (which his extraordinary service of the Church made proper for him,)† says: "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as OTHER APOSTLES, and as the brethren of the Lord and CEPHAS, (Peter) " ? ‡

Q. Does he contradict himself in this when he says: "Art thou loosed from a wife? seek not a wife. I would have you without solicitude; he that hath a wife is solicitous," etc. ? §

A. No; he is here writing not to *the ministers of the Church*, but to *all* the Christians in *one city*, Corinth. He is speaking of their special troubles, and does not even to them *command* but only *recommend* a single

* Eusebius also mentions this as a well-known traditional fact.—Ecc. Hist. iii. c. 30.

† And which indeed we rather infer from his words than find asserted of him either here or elsewhere in Scripture.

‡ 1 Cor. 9 : 5: "Have we not power to carry about a woman, a sister, as well as the rest of the Apostles and the brethren of the Lord and Cephas?"—Douay Bible. Here the Roman Church has not resisted the temptation to alter the words of God, so that they may not seem so much against it.

§ 1 Cor. 7 : 7 and 34. Douay Bible, as on pp. 319, 321.

life in some cases, according to their own judgment. "I suppose this is good for the present distress."* If he means this as a general rule of duty for Christians, then no one ought to marry, and what becomes of "the sacrament of Matrimony"?

Q. The Doctrinal Catechism affects† to "defy" any one to show that among the first Christians, the clergy were ever married: what say you to that?

A. Besides the Apostles and others spoken of as we have seen in the Holy Scriptures, (St.) Polycarp, the scholar of St. John, mentions the wife of Valens, a presbyter;‡ (St.) Cyprian was married.§ Clemens Alexandrinus, one hundred years after the Apostles, says that God "permits every man, whether *presbyter*, *deacon*, or layman, to be the husband of one wife, and to live in marriage without blame."|| Even more than one hundred years later when the superstitious notion of greater purity in a single life had already made some progress, the Council of Nice refused to compel married bishops to separate from their wives.¶ Still later, (St.) Gregory Nazianzen, himself *the son of a bishop*, says of his father and mother, that "a good and diligent bishop serves in the ministry nothing the worse for being married, but rather the better, and with more ability to do good."** As for the words of the "2d Council of Carthage," so ostentatiously quoted by the Doctrinal Catechism, they only enjoin "continent," that is, *virtuous* lives. Which live best in regard to this, whether the Protestant married, or the Roman unmarried clergy, we willingly leave to the world to say.

* 1 Cor. 7 : 26 : "I think therefore that this is good for the present necessity."—Donay Bible.

† I say, "affects," because the question is cunningly put in this way, "Were bishops, etc., permitted to marry *after* entering," etc.? We might not be able to relate the *wedding* of one, while we have ample evidence that they *had wives*. Indeed St. Paul seems to have required, as the general rule, that they should be married *before* being ordained.

‡ Ep. ad Phil. ii.

§ So Baronius admits, An. 248.

|| Strom. iii. 12.

¶ Can. Law 42. Dec. i. dis. 31. c. 12.

** Orat. funeb. Patris.

Q. What IN FACT has been the effect of forbidding the clergy to marry?

A. What we are warned of in the Holy Scriptures. It has exposed these unhappy men to dreadful danger of sin, so that, with the additional temptation and the terrible power of the secret "confession," they who ought to be the purest class, have been, with some bright exceptions, the vilest.*

Q. Is this vast and shocking evil overbalanced by any advantage which a single man would have over a married one, in more devotion to spiritual duties, and especially in a more faithful care of his people when plagues and other contagions ravage the country?

A. No; for Protestant pastors have in this country been more useful to the people and have shown at least equal bravery with Roman priests in the midst of Cholera and Yellow Fever.† Besides, the *contagion* of unchaste living in the clergy is far worse than these.

Q. What said one of the Popes just before the Reformation?

A. Pius II. said he saw "many reasons why wives should be taken away from priests;" but that he saw "*many more and more weighty* why they ought to be restored to them."‡

Q. Whom does St. Paul prophesy of as "forbidding to marry"?

A. Those who "*in the latter times* shall DEPART FROM THE FAITH."§

* The proofs of this are overwhelming, and from all kinds of witnesses, not only candid Protestants but Cardinals and *saints* of the Roman Church.—Baron. An. 900; St. Pet. Damian in Bruys, ii. 356; Limborch. Hist. of Inquis., 355; Llorente ib. iii; Dens' Moral Theol. 142-150; "Garden of the Soul," New-York: 1844, 213, 214, etc., etc. Cardinal Campeggio said at Worms that a priest may better live with harlots than with a wife.

† We of Louisiana *know* this.

‡ Fath. Paul ii. 505.

§ 1 Tim. 4: 1 and 3: "In the last times some shall depart from the faith, etc., forbidding to marry, to abstain from meats," etc.—Douay Bible. Why do they not say "*commanding* to abstain," etc., when in their own note they admit this to be the meaning?

On the Ceremonies of the Church.

CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Why does the Church make use of so many different ceremonies?

A. First, to give external expression to the interior sentiments of respect, devotion, and religion; secondly, to enliven and increase devotion and piety by moving and striking the senses; thirdly, to lead the simple and illiterate more easily to a knowledge of the mysteries of religion.

Q. Is there nothing superstitious in these ceremonies?

A. There was nothing superstitious in the ceremonies of the Old Law, why then should there be any thing superstitious in those of the New?

Q. Is the use of ceremonies authorized by Scripture?

A. St. Paul, 1 Cor. 14 : 14, says, "Let all things be done decently and according to order;" and the ceremonies of the Church contribute much to these ends.

Q. What would you say to a Protestant who condemns ceremonies?

A. You make them, I would reply, contribute to the decency, solemnity, and grandeur of the court, the camp, the bar, and the civic festival, and yet you would banish them from the service of God; your ball-room, your dining-room, and drawing-room, are all ceremony, and this to add to your dignity and grandeur in the eyes of men, and you would rob God's service of the solemnity and grandeur to which proper ceremonies so much contribute.

Q. Have you any other reply?

A. Your whole service, I would say, is only one great ceremony; why build churches, when you can serve God at home; why go to church, when, in your own dwelling, you can study the Bible, and when your interpretation is as good and as correct as that of your minister; why have your children baptized, since many

of you maintain, that baptism is only a ceremony—that it does not remit original sin; why receive the sacrament in the Church, if it be only a bit of bread and wine, which you may receive at home; why do you stand uncovered when the minister prays, when sitting is more convenient and less troublesome?

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Are some *forms* or outward acts of worship necessary in religion?

A. Yes; we are commanded by God in his Book, thus to show forth our love for him and to confess our Lord Jesus Christ. (See Matt. 18 : 20; Heb. 10 : 25; Ps. 100 and 122, etc.)

Q. Has he told us the precise forms in which we should worship?

A. The two sacraments are positively established, but other forms are left in a great degree to the judgment of the churches.

Q. What, plainly, should be the nature of these forms in general?

A. They should be, First, *intelligible*, that is, such as can be understood by all the worshippers; Second, simple, spiritual, and serious, instead of being either showy or silly; Third, not teaching or favoring any false doctrine, or imitating the superstitions of heathen or other false worshippers; and fourth, reminding us of the blessed Gospel, of our Lord, and of our duty.

Q. Ought you to be ambitious of *display* in the worship of God, because "your ball-room, your dining-room, and drawing-room, are all ceremony, and this to add to your dignity and grandeur in the eyes of men"?

A. No; these displays are produced by human *pride*. The Church should call me away from this to a simple and humble life by a worship that, far from imitating worldly vanity, does not go at all *beyond* St. Paul's rule: "Let all things be done decently and in order."

Q. What has been the effect of a fondness for showy worship?

A. Great harm even in the Church of Christ. The

worship of the first Christians was very simple, as we see both in the New Testament and all the earliest writers. The Jews and Pagans reproached them for their WANT of *incense, altars, rich garments of priests, images, holy water, candles burning in the day-time, and processions*. For instance, Lactantius says of the heathen, "They light up candles to God as if he lived in the dark," etc.* and so, for a Christian to *burn incense at all*, was understood to be an apostasy.† Yet within a few hundred years after the Apostles, the Christians, envying and imitating the pomp of Pagan worship, adopted all of these things into theirs, even worshipping some of the old heathen idols as images of "saints,"‡ and giving the Bishop of Rome the ancient title of the supreme heathen priest of that city, *Pontifex Maximus*, even (just as one of the basest of these heathen, the tyrant Caligula, had compelled men to do to him) thinking it a great honor to kiss the toe of this Christian pastor! §

CHAP. II.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Why are wax tapers blessed and burnt on the Festival of the Purification in our churches?

A. To put us in mind that our Saviour, who is the light of the world, appeared, for the first time, on that day, in the Temple.

Q. Why are ashes distributed on Ash-Wednesday, the first day of Lent?

A. To remind us, that we are only dust and ashes, and that we ought to enter upon that season, in which

* VI. c. 2.

† Tertullian de Idol.—Arnob. cont. Gent.—Min. Felix, etc.

‡ See the Letters from Rome of that grave, learned, and candid scholar, Conyers Middleton, who wrote the Life of Cicero. He went to Rome to study its Pagan antiquities, but was so struck by the resemblance to them of its modern *Christian* worship, that he examined the whole subject with great care.

§ One instance of this, related to me by a friend who had often witnessed it, is the worship at *St. Omer* of the pretended images of Sts. Peter and Paul; doubtless some idols of Thor, Wodin, or other Gothic gods.

Jesus was humbled and mortified for our sake, with an humble and mortified spirit.

Q. Why are Palm branches blessed and distributed on the Sunday before Easter?

A. To remind us of the triumphant entry of our Saviour into Jerusalem.

Q. Why are bells of churches baptized?

A. They are not baptized; they are only blessed in the same manner as churches.

Q. Why are bread, wine, eggs, and other things, blessed?

A. To induce the Almighty to shower down his benedictions upon those who use them.

Q. When things are consecrated to the service of God, do they, in reality, become more sacred?

A. Yes; for Christ says, Matt. 23 : 17, 19, "Ye foolish and blind, for whether is greater, the gold, or the Temple which sanctifieth the gold? Ye blind, for whether is greater, the gift, or the altar which sanctifieth the gift?" Where you see the gold *sanctified* by the Temple, and the gift by the altar.

Q. Does the Scripture allow the sanctifying or blessing of inanimate things?

A. Certainly; for St. Paul, 1 Tim. 4 : 4, 5, says: "Every creature of God is good, . . . for it is *sanctified by the word of God and prayer*."

Q. What does St. Grègory of Nyssa say? (Orat. de Bap. Jesu Christi.)

A. "The mystical oil and wine before benediction are common things and of no virtue, but after benediction both of them have a great virtue."

Q. Is it not a superstitious practice to make use of inanimate things for religious purposes, to procure blessings?

A. Certainly not; for the Scripture would, in that case, teach superstition.

Q. Where does the Scripture authorize this practice?

A. St. Mark 6 : 13, says: "And they cast out many devils, and *anointed with oil* many that were sick and healed them." In St. John 5 : 4, we have, "And an angel of the Lord descended at certain times into the pond, and *the water was moved*, and he that went *down*

first into the pond after the motion of the water, was made whole of whatsoever infirmity he lay under."

Q. Have you any thing in 4 Kings 5 : 10, on this subject ?

A. Yes : " And Eliseus sent a messenger to him, saying, Go, and *wash seven times* in the Jordan, and thy flesh shall recover health, and thou shalt be clean ;" and in verse 14th, the order is complied with, and he is made clean.

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Are these ceremonies commanded in the New Testament or mentioned there as then in use among Christians ?

A. No ; nor any thing of the kind whatever.

Q. Why are they not used in the Reformed Churches ?

A. Because such of them as are not positively superstitious are unnecessary and childish. The noblest worship is that which, while expressing all the piety we feel, is very plain and simple. Otherwise it naturally passes into a *show* which we are *looking at*, instead of a *worship* in which we *join*.

Q. What of the baptism of bells ?

A. The Doctrinal Catechism denies this ; yet it is certain that the Roman Church has a ceremony of *giving names* to church bells, when they *have sponsors*, and are *sprinkled with water in the name of the Trinity*, and that is commonly called a *baptism*.*

Q. Should we have eggs and other food blessed in church because St. Paul says, " Every creature of God is good," etc. ? (See p. 328.)

A. He is speaking of those who "*in the latter days*" should "*depart from the faith*," "FORBIDDING TO MARRY and COMMANDING TO ABSTAIN FROM MEATS." (See p. 324.) He says that there is no religion in eating one kind of food rather than another, (for instance, fish and eggs instead of meat ;) "*for every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused*, if it be received with

* In my own town, lately some of the most intelligent people of the Roman congregation asked some Protestants, " Who were the godfathers and godmothers of their new bell ?"

thanksgiving, for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer.”* Does this mean that we are to bring all of our food to church to be blessed; and why not *all* if *any*? Pious Protestants indeed follow St. Paul, when they ask God’s blessing on all their food at every meal.

Q. Ought we then to have eggs blessed in church because God in ancient times made use of oil and water in working great miracles?

A. It puzzles one to *answer* an *argument* which seems of itself so childish and even unmeaning.

CHAP. III.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Whence has holy water its virtue?

A. From the prayers of the Church used in blessing it, and from the prayers and piety of those who use it.

Q. What are these prayers?

A. The priest, in blessing it, prays that against those who use it, the intrigues of the devil may be defeated by the Holy Spirit of God; and the people, whilst using it, pray in these beautiful words: “Sprinkle me, O Lord, with hyssop, and I shall be cleansed, wash me, and I shall become whiter than snow.”

Q. Is the use of holy water of very ancient origin in the Church of God?

A. It is mentioned in the fifth chapter of Numbers: “And he (the priest) shall take *holy water* in an earthen vessel.” In Num. 8 : 7, it is again mentioned: “Let them be sprinkled with the water of purification.” (See also Exod., chap. 19th and 30th.)

Q. May holy water be used under the New Law?

A. Certainly; for every creature of God may be sanctified by the word of God and prayer. (1 Tim. 4 : 5.)

* 1 Tim. 4 : 4, 5: “For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be rejected that is received with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer.”—Douay Bible.

Q. Did the early Church use it?

A. It is mentioned in the Apostolical Instit., Lib. viii. cap. 35; St. Cyprian, Lib. i. Ep. 12; St. Jerom., Ep. 12; St. Basil de Spiritu Sancto., cap. 27; St. Greg. Mag. Lib. ix. Ep. 71; St. Epiphan. Haer. 30; Euseb., Lib. v. cap. 21.

CHAP. III.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Why do not the Reformed Churches use holy water?

A. Because it is one of those same foolish superstitions which have degraded the Church wherever they have prevailed.

Q. Has the use of water by the Jewish priests in some of their ceremonies any thing to do with Christian worship?

A. No more than "the blood of bulls and of goats." (Heb. 10 : 4.) All this passed away with the coming of the New Covenant of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Q. From whom did the Church copy the use of "holy water," long after the Apostles?*

A. From the Pagans, to whose customs it has a most striking resemblance, while it is utterly unlike the use of water in the Jewish ceremonies. The former (like the Roman Church now) kept at the doors of their temples, a vessel of water which had been blessed by a priest, and a little salt thrown into it. Every worshipper on entering the temple sprinkled himself with this, and it was used in various parts of the worship. (St.) Justin Martyr (forty years after the Apostles) says that "when *the demons* heard the true baptism foretold by the prophets, they invented the custom for their votaries of sprinkling themselves with water when they entered the temples."† Even the Jesuit La Cerda, speaking of this heathen "lustration," says: "Hence was derived the custom of the holy Church to provide purifying of holy water at the entrance of their churches."‡

* Even Platina, a Roman writer, of high authority, dates it after the days of the Apostles.

† Apol. i. 62.

‡ As quoted by Middleton.

CHAP. IV.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Why do Catholics make the sign of the Cross upon themselves, and why is it so frequently used in the Church service?

A. Because it is a brief profession of the Christian faith, and its use is derived by universal tradition from the Apostles.

Q. How is it a profession of our faith?

A. As often as we make the sign of the Cross, repeating at the same time these words: "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"—we profess ourselves followers of, and believers in, redemption by the Cross, and we at the same time profess our faith in the three Persons of the Adorable Trinity.

Q. How do you prove that the use of this sign is as ancient as the Church itself?

A. From the testimony of the early Fathers and writers: "At the commencement of all our actions, whether we come in or go out; whether we go to dress, to the bath, to the table, or to rest; whether we take a chair or a light, let us always begin by making the sign of the Cross on our foreheads. This practice is not commanded by a formal law of the Scripture, but tradition has taught it, custom confirms it, and faith observes it." Tertul. de Corona, cap. 4.

Q. Do any of the other Fathers mention it?

A. Origen says the same thing. (Select. in Ezech. cap. 9.) St. Cyril recommends the same practice to the faithful. (Catech. 4.) St. Basil, De Spirit. Sanc. cap. 27, No. 66, expressly tells us that it is an apostolical tradition.

Q. Why is the sign of the Cross made so often in the holy Sacrifice, the administration of the Sacraments, the benedictions and exterior worship of the Church?

A. To teach us, that every practice, every ceremony, rite, and service, has its virtue solely through the merits and death of Jesus Christ upon the Cross, and that all

God's graces are showered down upon us on account of his sufferings and his blood.

Q. Were not the Christian Copts guilty of superstition in making the sign of the Cross with a hot iron on the foreheads of their children, and was not this the origin of the Catholic practice?

A. Protestants must be very ignorant to make this assertion. The sign of the Cross, not however made by any painful means, was universally used in the Church. The Copts made the sign of the Cross visible on the foreheads of their children to prevent them from being stolen by the Mahometans. (See l'Abbe Renaudot.)

CHAP. IV.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Did the first Christians often "make the sign of the Cross"?

A. Such a custom began soon after the Apostles, though there is *no reason whatever* to suppose that it was practised in their days. The *first mention* of it is about one hundred years after them, and no one ascribed it to *them* until two hundred years later still.

Q. Why do not the Reformed Churches practice this?

A. Because, though quite innocent at first, yet, as afterwards used and as still maintained in the Roman Church, it is another of those superstitions which dishonor the Church. For now a *magical effect* (which the first Christians never thought of) is ascribed to it, of driving away demons and dangers, etc. Therefore, since it is surely *not commanded in the word of God*, we do well to omit it.

Q. Do we need to "make the sign of the Cross" to remind us of our Redeemer's dying on the Cross for our salvation?

A. No; we can much better remind ourselves of this by frequent reading of the Gospel and prayer to him in our hearts. If we do this, it is enough; and if we do not do this, all such signs are only superstitious. There are millions of devout and virtuous Christians who never "make the sign of the cross;" while there are millions of others who make it often, while they continue worldly, vicious, and profane.

CHAP. V.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What do the vestments worn by the Priest signify ?

A. Each of them signifies some accompaniment of our Saviour's passion. The *Amice* signifies the piece of linen with which our Saviour was blindfolded. (Matt. 26.) The *Alb* represents the white garment with which Christ was, in mockery, clothed by Herod. (Luke 23.) The *Girdle*, *Maniple*, and *Stole*, represent the cords and fetters with which Christ was bound. (John 18 : 12, 24.) The *Chasuble* represents the purple garment which the soldiers put upon our Divine Saviour.

Q. What is meant by the Cross marked on the Chasuble ?

A. It represents the Cross which our Saviour carried through the streets of Jerusalem.

Q. What is meant by the corporal and the veil of the chalice ?

A. They represent the linen clothes in which our Saviour's body was wrapped, whilst it lay in the tomb.

Q. What does the altar signify ?

A. Calvary, upon which our Saviour was crucified, and also the Table used for the Last Supper.

Q. Why is the Missal carried before the Gospel from the right to the left side of the Altar ?

A. To commemorate the transference of the Gospel of Christ from the Jews who rejected it, to the Gentiles who received it.

Q. Why do we stand during the reading of the Gospel ?

A. To express our readiness to obey the orders of the Son of God.

Q. Why does the priest put a drop of water into the wine in the Chalice ?

A. To represent the union of the divine and human natures in Christ.

Q. Why does the priest elevate the consecrated elements ?

A. To represent the elevation of the Cross after our Saviour was nailed to it.

Q. Why does the priest divide the Host into three parts, and let one of them drop into the chalice?

A. To signify the separation of our Saviour's body from his blood and his soul from both; and to represent the descent of his soul to Limbo, where the spirits were in prison.

Q. Why does the priest pray sometimes in a low, and at other times in a loud voice?

A. Because Christ did so, whilst he was hanging on the Cross.

Q. Why does the priest bless the people at the end of Mass?

A. To represent the benediction which our Saviour gave to his disciples before he ascended to heaven.

CHAP. V.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What must we say of these vestments and other usages of the Roman Church?

A. That they show further how its worship is showy and formal, and yet not majestic; something for the people merely to *see and hear*, instead of praying to and praising God with their hearts.

Q. Were such things used by the first Christians?

A. No; their worship, like that of Protestants now, was very simple. Thus, while a robe of office for the minister which is simple both in shape and color, (not gaudy garments of many kinds, like those of heathen priests,) reverent postures in both him and the people, and his giving them the Lord's blessing, are very proper in our worship, these other things are foolish and wrong.

Q. How did these foolish things and others like them come into use among Christians?

A. As we have already seen from an ambition to rival the pomp of Jewish and heathen ceremonies, (of some of which these are plain imitations,) and also a well-meaning notion of in this way drawing men more easily into the Church.

Q. Was this wise and proper?

A. No; for if men are converted in this way they remain at heart as much heathen as before. The Church also is itself corrupted and degraded by superstitious and frivolous forms, and the very dignity of God's worship is *lessened*. For simple and yet solemn forms are much more dignified and impressive than these.

Q. What plain example of this can you mention?

A. The simple yet very majestic service of the Protestant Episcopal Church is seen in fact to produce a greater seriousness and attention in both minister and worshippers than that of the Roman Church. In this latter it is very common to see the priest himself careless and irreverent in his manner, and most of the people looking on as if at a show, or looking around without any interest at all.

CHAP. VI.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Why is Mass said in the Latin tongue and not in the vernacular?

A. In the first place, That the service of God may be every where uniformly the same; secondly, That the same words and same prayers may be used in order to avoid the changes, to which all living languages are so much subject; thirdly, That the same language may be used over the whole Church, that the pastors of every country may understand one another, and that the people passing from one country to another may have no difficulty in joining at the public service, it being every where the same.

Q. Are not the people injured by having the public service in a language which they do not understand?

A. By no means; for surely God understands all languages—prayers will reach His Throne, no matter in what language they may be uttered; and as to the people, they have the prayers of Mass translated into their own tongue in their Prayer Books.

Q. Does not St. Paul say, 1 Cor. 14 : 19, "But in the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I may instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue"?

A. Yes; but St. Paul is speaking here of instruction, as is evident from the words, "That I may instruct others also;" and the Catholic Church in all her sermons, private prayers, and instructions, addresses her children in a language which they do understand.

Q. Do not Protestants make frequent use of 1 Cor. 14, against Catholics on this subject?

A. Yes: but if Protestants would think before they speak, they would see that this chapter has nothing to do with the question. St. Paul, in the whole of this chapter, is reprobating the vain display of miraculous tongues in preachings, exhortations, or instructions, made by recent converts, more to show their gifts than to glorify God or edify the people.

Q. Can this chapter be turned against Protestants so as to support the Catholic practice?

A. Yes; in verse 5, St. Paul says, "For greater is he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues, unless perhaps he INTERPRET, that the Church may receive edification;" now the Catholic service is interpreted for the use of all. Again, verse 13, "Therefore he that speaketh by a tongue, *let him pray that he interpret;*" where speaking tongues is not found fault with, if interpretation follow. In verse 27, "If any speak with a tongue, . . . *let one interpret.*" In fine, in verse 39, the Protestant argument is annihilated by the Apostle. "Wherefore, brethren, be zealous to prophesy, and *forbid not to speak with tongues.*"

Q. Is the Latin in reality an unknown tongue?

A. None but those who are very ignorant will venture to say that it is. In some countries it is still the vernacular tongue; the learned of every country are acquainted with it; and of all languages it is, at least, to a certain extent, the most universally known.

Q. Is the custom of not performing the service in the vernacular tongue confined to the Catholic Church?

A. No; the Greek, Ethiopian, Indian, and Muscovite schismatics, say Mass in their ancient, and not in their

modern tongues. The Syrians and Egyptians say Mass in Syriac, though Arabic be their vulgar tongue. Arabic is the language of the Melchites and Georgians, though they say Mass in Greek.

Q. Is there any other reason why the Mass should be said in Latin?

A. The Mass is the one sacrifice of the whole Church, foretold by Malachi, as an offering to be made in every place under heaven: hence, all Christians have, in the *oneness* and unchangeableness of the language in which it is offered up, a strict bond of union; unity is preserved by uniformity of rite.

Q. Is it necessary that all the people should understand every word used in the Liturgy?

A. Certainly not. It is only necessary that they should comprehend the nature of the action performed, and unite their intention and devotion with that of the priest.

Q. What do we find in the Jewish Church?

A. The Jews lost the use of the Hebrew language during the Baylonish captivity so entirely, that when Nehemias and Esdras read the Law from the Scriptures to the people, they were obliged to interpret it. (Nehemias 8 : 13.)

Q. What do you infer from this?

A. The Jews spoke Syriac; the Scriptures were not translated into that language until after the time of our Saviour; yet the Hebrew was still retained in the religious service of the Jews. Besides, from Levit. 16 and Luke 1, it is very evident that the people were not required to be even so near the priest as to be able to hear him; for they were not allowed to be even in the Tabernacle when he prayed for himself and the whole congregation.

CHAP. VI.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. In what language ought worship to be celebrated ?

A. Plainly in that understood and commonly used by the people ; for worship *is* their expressing the piety of their hearts by words ; and of course they can do this best in their own language.

Q. Do any Churches, in spite of plain common-sense, forbid this ?

A. Yes, especially that of Rome, which has worship in *Latin*, a language of which most of its members do not understand a word.

Q. How did this strange practice begin ?

A. At first, Latin was the language most spoken in Western Europe, and it continued in use at Rome even when it was no longer commonly spoken elsewhere. So, in the Dark Ages, by the power of the Popes and clergy, it was made the language of worship in all these countries, though none but the most learned persons understood it. What few books there were then, were in Latin, and belonged to the clergy, who were a little less ignorant than the rest of the people, and could—many of them—read and write. Saying the prayers and praises of the people in this “dead” Latin language, helped them to keep the people ignorant, and to have all knowledge to themselves.

Q. Of the various excuses which the Doctrinal Catechism gives for this absurd practice, what do you say to this first, “That the service of God may be every where uniformly the same” ?

A. The *united worship* of all his people which pleases God, is, when they have all *the same spirit* of love and faith. This *one spirit* is *even more grandly* expressed by each nation’s calling upon God in its own tongue, for *he* hears in them all the same meaning. But if we use an unknown tongue, we can hardly have the true spirit at all. This agrees to what our Lord has said, “God is a spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth ;”* (that is, understand-

* John 4 : 24 : “God is a spirit, and they that adore him must adore him in spirit and in truth.”—Douay Bible.

ing and meaning what they do and say.) So, also, in the Acts of the Apostles: "We do hear them speak *in our own tongues* the wonderful works of God,"* and in the Revelation: "Out of every kindred, and *tongue*, and nation, and people."†

Q. What of this excuse, "In order to avoid the changes," etc.? (See p. 336.)

A. That is, to save the people from ever not understanding *every word* of their worship, they must be *kept from ever understanding a single word of it!* No: if the language of a people changes, the language of their worship *ought* to change enough for them to understand it. But the same words have been used in English now for three hundred years, and are plain to all the people.

Q. What of this excuse, "That the pastors of every country, etc., and the people passing from one country to another may have no difficulty in joining at the public service," etc.?

A. That is, worship must be made unmeaning to almost all the people, in order that it may be known by a few travellers, whether priests or learned laymen! For other travellers, indeed, would find no difference: they did not understand it at home, and they are *no worse off abroad*, (how could they well be?) as they do not understand it then!

Q. Is not the Latin generally "an unknown tongue" to the people?

A. Let each one who reads this, now ask himself, Do I understand Latin well when I hear it spoken? How many of even the best informed can say, *Yes?* Is it, then, less than impudence to say, as the Doctrinal Catechism does, that "none but those who are very ignorant will venture to say that it is"? *No one can mention the country* where Latin is now the language of the common people.

Q. Is it enough to have translations‡ of the Latin in the people's prayer-books?

* 2 : 11 : "We have heard them speak in our own tongues the wonderful works of God."—Douay Bible.

† 7 : 9 : "Of all nations, and tribes, and peoples, and tongues."—Ib.

‡ These were never thought of until *since the Reformation*.

A. No ; for *why say the Latin at all*, and make me translate while I pray ? Besides, there will always be many worshippers who *can not read*, and can only pray, and learn as they hear. Is no regard to be paid to them ?*

Q. Does the Word of God speak at all of worshipping in an unknown tongue ?

A. Yes, *to condemn it most severely*. Almost all of the 14th chapter of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, is a powerful and beautiful argument to show that we should try to make all our worship understood by all who hear, so that it may do them good. Read it for yourself. It was one of the miracles of those days, that a Christian could sometimes speak a language which he had never learned. This, like other miracles, was meant to convince unbelievers : "Wherefore tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not."† But the age of miracles has passed away, while the duty of worship still remains. And here is what the Apostle says of that : "For if I *pray* in an unknown tongue my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful. What is it then ? I will pray with the spirit *and with the understanding also* : I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing *with the understanding also*. Else when thou shalt *bless* with the spirit, how shall *he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say, Amen* at thy giving of thanks, *seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest ?* For thou verily givest thanks well, *but the other is not edified*. I thank my God that I speak with tongues more than you all. Yet *in the Church, I had rather speak FIVE WORDS WITH MY UNDERSTANDING, that by my voice I might TEACH OTHERS ALSO, than TEN THOUSAND words in an UNKNOWN TONGUE*. Brethren, *be not children in understanding*."‡ Note well, that the Doctrinal Catechism,

* Much the greater part of the lay people of the Roman Church are usually of this class.

† v. 22 : "Wherefore tongues are for a sign not to believers, but to unbelievers."—Douay Bible.

‡ 14 : 20 : "For if I pray in a tongue my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is without fruit. What is it, then ? I will pray in the spirit, I will pray also in the understanding : I will sing with the

while it culls out from this chapter of St. Paul (see page 337) a few expressions which do not apply directly to this question, *does not quote* THESE WORDS *or notice them at all.*

Q. Does the Roman Church even have *only its prayers* in Latin?

A. No; for beside Latin *psalms* and *hymns*, in which the worshipper is supposed to sing the praise of God, though he does not open his lips, or even understand a word of them, certain parts of Holy Scripture are read in the service *for the instruction of the people*, but in THIS SAME LATIN.

Q. Did the Jewish Church worship in an unknown tongue?

A. There is no reason to think so whatever. Look at the very verse of Scripture to which the Doctrinal Catechism refers, and see if it says any thing of the kind. On the contrary, it is plain, from the Acts of the Apostles, that the Hebrew was generally understood even in their days. Relating how a mob at Jerusalem attempted to tear St. Paul in pieces, and how he, being rescued from their hands, addressed the assembled people, it is said: "And when they heard that he spake in the Hebrew tongue, they kept the more silence."*

Q. Does this having worship in Latin do any actual harm?

A. Yes; it helps with the other superstitions already mentioned, to make religion unmeaning and formal, and even, to some, ridiculous. All public worship might and ought to *teach the people*, but this is only a dumb show. Yet this is the Church which, upon the plea of "*instructing the ignorant*," ventures to use images in worship, which God has plainly forbidden! It is said that some Roman bishops have the epistle and gospel of their service read in the language of the people. If

spirit; I will sing also with the understanding. Else, if thou shalt bless in the spirit, how shall he that holdeth the place of the unlearned say Amen, to thy blessing? because he knoweth not what thou sayest. For thou indeed givest thanks well, but the other is not edified. I thank my God, I speak with all your tongues. But in the Church I would rather speak five words with my understanding, that I may instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue. Brethren, do not become children in sense."—Douay Bible

* 22: 2: "And when they heard that he spoke to them in the Hebrew tongue, they kept the more silence."—Ib.

this is so, it is because they are forced to it by the overwhelming common-sense of the thing against a law of their Church, in a decree of the Council of Trent. (Sess. xxii. ch. 8.) Le Courayer, a learned Roman priest, in his note on this, says candidly: "It is certain that all the original liturgies were composed in the language of the countries where they were first used. St. Paul appears to decide clearly enough in favor of the language of the common people. But if he can be interpreted differently, it appears at least, that if the use of an unknown tongue in the prayers is not contrary to religion, it is extremely so to reason and good sense."*



On Pictures or Images.

DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What is the use of Images?

A. They serve, in the first place, to adorn the Church; secondly, to instruct the ignorant; and, thirdly, to excite devotion.

Q. Do Catholics adore images?

A. No; Catholics adore God only.

Q. Do Catholics invoke images?

A. No Catholic ever thought of such a thing. Catholics neither hope for, nor ask succor or grace from them.

Q. What says the 25th Session of the Council of Trent?

A. That we honor pictures, or images, not for any virtue these inanimate things possess, but on account of the originals which they represent. The honor is given to the original, not to the picture; so that in uncovering the head, or kneeling before a picture of Jesus Christ, we honor and adore Jesus Christ himself.

* Note on Father Paul, ii. 318.

Q. Does not the commandment forbid the making or the use of pictures or images?

A. No. It only forbids worshipping them as gods. "Thou shalt not adore them nor serve them."

Q. If the Scripture condemned, as idolatry, the making or use of pictures or images, would not the Scripture contradict itself?

A. Yes: for in that case God himself would contradict his own command; and in fact order that idolatry which, in the commandment, he had forbid, Exod. 25 : 18 : "God said to Moses, thou shalt make also *two cherubims of beaten gold* on the two sides of the oracle; let one cherub be on one side, and the other on the other." See also 20, 21, 22 verses of same chapter.

Q. We see here the likenesses of heavenly things made by the express command of God; did he any where order, in the same manner, the likenesses of earthly things?

A. In the same Exodus, chap. 28 : 33, he does so : "And beneath, at the feet of the same tunic, round about, thou shalt make as it were *pomegranates* of violet, and purple, and scarlet, twice dyed, with *little bells* set between." See also 34, 35 verses; and 3 Kings, (1 Kings, Prot. Trans.,) chap. 7 : 23, 24, 25, 29. Again, 3 Kings 6 : 29; and 3 Kings 10 : 19. Read also Osee, (Hosea,) 3 : 4.

Q. Did God ever use an image for miraculous purposes?

A. Yes; in Num. 21 : 8, "And the Lord said to him, (Moses,) make a *brazen serpent*, and set it up for a sign; whoever being struck shall look on it, shall live;" and in verse 9 you will see the miraculous effect produced.

Q. You have said that pictures and images adorn the house of God, is it proper to adorn temples?

A. Certainly. The Royal Prophet says, Psalm 25 : 8 : "I have loved, O Lord, the *beauty* of thy house, and the place where thy glory dwelleth." And in 2 Kings 7 : 2, (Protes. 2 Sam.,) David is ashamed to dwell in a house of cedar, whilst *the Ark of God is lodged within skins*. See also Psalm 131 : 3, 4, 5. Catholics glory in the splendor of God's house and the grandeur of his service; and in this they imitate the example of David and Solomon, (see opening of his temple,) rather than

the niggardly parsimony of the traitor Judas, who wished to sell the box of precious ointment and give the price to the poor, and for which he received such a severe reprimand from Christ himself, John 12 : 3, etc.

Q. Why do Protestants strip the house of God of every ornament, whilst they are so profusely liberal in the decoration of their own dwellings, and all their worldly monuments and public buildings?

A. It is because their religion is essentially that of this world. They flatter themselves that they may obtain heaven at the least possible expense. They give God's glory to themselves and to their worldly heroes; and their ministers are too much engaged in providing for wives and families, to give themselves any trouble about, or spend any of their incomes in, the erection or decoration of splendid temples to the living God.

On Pictures or Images.

THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Does the Lord God permit the use of images in worship?

A. No; he expressly forbids it by one of the Ten Commandments and repeats this more than a hundred times in the Holy Book.*

Q. May we use images in worship in spite of this commandment, if we only say that "we do not honor them, but the originals," that "we adore God only"?

A. This is just what the learned Pagans said to the first Christians. We reply as they did, No; God *refuses* that kind of worship. *Beside* the first commandment, Thou shalt have *no other gods* beside me, he gives as the second commandment, "*Thou shalt not make unto thee ANY GRAVEN IMAGE, or any LIKENESS OF ANY THING that is in heaven above or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth :*

* Those who have been persuaded by their pastors not to study the Scriptures would, on reading them through, be astonished to see how much is said against image-worship.

thou shalt not BOW DOWN thyself to them nor serve them : for I, the Lord thy God, am A JEALOUS GOD," etc.*

Q. Does the Roman Church teach the second Commandment to the people ?

A. No. This commandment is so plain against image-worship that they call it *only a part of the first*. So, to make out the ten, the tenth, which forbids all coveting in these words, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man-servant," etc.,† is torn to pieces and made into two ! Then in the common catechisms for the people, the Ten Commandments are given thus : *First*, "Thou shalt not have strange gods before me ;" (the words against images being left out as *of no great importance*.) *Second*, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain," etc. *Ninth*, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife ;" *Tenth*, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, nor his," etc ! ‡ There can be no honest question about the proper division of the commandments. The Jewish Church always numbered them as we Protestants do, and so also did the first Christians, and so have the Eastern Churches continued to do to this day.§ You see the Roman Church itself can not give the tenth commandment, as uttered with the voice of God on Mount Sinai, *as mentioning the wife first*, but begins : "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, neither shalt thou desire his wife, nor his servant," etc. *Why then has it made this change ?* WHY ?

Q. Did God contradict his own plain second commandment, by

* Ex. 20 4, 5 : "Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing nor the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above or in the earth beneath, nor of those things that are in the waters under the earth. Thou shalt not adore them nor serve them. I am the Lord thy God, mighty, jealous," etc.—Douay Bible.

† 17 : "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, neither shalt thou desire his wife, nor his servant," etc.—Ib.

‡ Dr. Geddes, a learned Roman priest, admits this. (Crit. Remarks, p. 420.)

§ Long. Cat. Russian Church. Dr. Geddes also admits that the Protestant division is the right one, and that it was used by the Jews and by all the early Fathers. See also Josephus Antiq. iii. c. 5.

having the cherubim upon the ark and the pomegranates and little bells on the High Priest's robe?

A. It is childish, if not profane, to say so; these things were not knelt to and bowed before in worship, as pictures and images are in Roman Churches. The cherubim were never even *seen* by the people.

Q. Is the making of the brazen serpent by Moses like the adoration of images?

A. In this case, God had sent fiery serpents among the muttering Israelites. "Therefore the people came to Moses and said, We have sinned, for we have spoken against the Lord and against thee; pray unto the Lord that he take away the serpents from us, and Moses prayed for the people. And the Lord said unto Moses, Make thee a fiery serpent and set it upon a pole, and it shall come to pass that every one who is bitten when he looketh upon it shall live. And Moses made a serpent of brass and put it upon a pole, and it came to pass, that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass he lived."* (No more mention is made of the brazen serpent for ages after this; it was laid aside and forgotten.) God cured such of the poisoned people as would commit themselves to his mercy. He commanded this image to be made for that special case, that every suffering and dying person might by turning his eyes to it, show his trust in the pity of God. Shall any one then dare to make this an excuse for using images *in worship*, without his permission and even flatly against his commandment?

Q. Was this brazen serpent *ever* used by the people after this?

A. Yes, once more, seven hundred years after Moses. When the King Hezekiah began to reign, the Jews had fallen into dreadful idolatries, and had hunted up this

* Numb. 21 : 7-9: "Upon which they came to Moses and said, We have sinned because we have spoken against the Lord and thee: pray that he may take away these serpents from us. And Moses prayed for the people. And the Lord said to him, Make a brazen serpent and set it up for a sign; whosoever being struck shall look on it, shall live. Moses therefore made a brazen serpent and set it up for a sign, which when they that were bitten looked upon, they were healed."—Douay Bible.

“venerable relic,” and used to worship it. So, “he removed the high places and *brake the images*, and cut down the groves, and *brake in pieces* THE BRAZEN SERPENT *that Moses had made*; for unto those days the children of Israel *did burn incense unto it*; and he called it Nehushtan,”* (that is, *a piece of brass*.) This same excuse for image-worship about the “brazen serpent” was used by the Pagans in Tertullian’s day, and he shows its falseness just as I have done.†

Q. Was the second commandment changed by the New Testament?

A. There is not the least reason to think so, but on the contrary, it is often repeated there; as, “Little children, keep yourselves from *idols*,” (images,)‡—“what agreement hath the temple of God with *idols*?”§ (images.) *Idol did* mean simply *image* in the language of those times. For instance, (St.) Jerome says: “By *idols* we mean *images of those who have died*.”||

Q. Why, probably, has God absolutely forbidden image-worship?

A. Because he who knows us better than we know ourselves, sees that worship will become generally false and formal, if images are used in it. We see that in fact it does always work that way with the more ignorant. In many countries, as in the Pope’s own dominions, most of the people regard the image itself as a god, and think it hears their prayers. The priests play upon this credulity with tales of the images winking, smiling, and working miracles. Some writers of the Roman Church, in good repute, have even taught that worship should be given to the image itself; as one bishop did in these words: “Therefore it is to be confessed that believers in the Church not only worship *before* the image (as some say, perhaps by way of cau-

* 2 Kings 18 : 4: “He destroyed the high places and broke the statues in pieces and cut down the groves and broke the brazen serpent which Moses had made: for till that time the children of Israel burnt incense to it; and he called its name Nohestan.”—Douay Bible.

† De Idol. c. 6.

‡ 1 John 5 : 21. So the Douay Bible.

§ 2 Cor. 6 : 16. So the Douay Bible.

|| Com. in Is. c. 87.

tion,) but *worship the image itself*, and with the same worship as belongs to that of which it is an image.”*

Q. Is it then very pious to set these up in churches, that we may do honor to the worship of God?

A. We *dishonor* him shamefully in this, by breaking his plain *commandment*. It is most presumptuous in us then to insist upon worshipping him with idols, saying (like the Pagans) that we do not give our worship to the image but to God by it. Besides, we tempt the ignorant to worship these images as “other gods.” And then they are no fitting *ornaments* even, of a temple of the most glorious *unseen* God. They can only give it a childish resemblance to a heathen temple.

Q. What was the opinion of the first Christians about images?

A. Here are the words of several of the chief “Fathers.” *Tertullian*: “God hath forbidden an image or idol as well to be made as to be worshipped. Some men will say, I make it but worship it not; as though he durst not worship it for any other cause than that very one for which he ought not to make it, I mean in both cases *on account of displeasing God*. Indeed *thou worshippest it who givest occasion to others to worship it.*”† *Minutius Felix*: “They (the Christians) have neither altars, nor temples, nor any noticeable images.”‡ *Lactantius* argues with the Pagans against these very excuses of image-worship which the Doctrinal Catechism makes, and says finally: “Without doubt, there is no religion where there is an image.”§ (St.) *Athanasius*: “When you carve or paint images in order to know God by them, you surely do an unworthy and improper thing.” “The invention of images came of no good but of evil.”|| (St.) *Augustine*: “It is abominable thus to make an image of God.”

* Jacobus Nanciantus. (St.) Thom. Aquin. says that the cross is to worshipped with the same worship as God himself. Sum. Theol. iii. q. 25. art. 4. These men have never been cursed or punished by the Roman Church for such words, while many holy men have been, for opposing image-worship.

† De Idol c. 4, 6.

‡ Oct. ix. 67.

§ ii. 19.

|| 171 Hom.

"Just so *they deserved to err* who sought Christ and his Apostles *not in the books of Holy Scripture but in painted walls.*"* (St.) Epiphanius: "My children, be ye mindful that ye *bring no images into the churches*, and that ye erect none in the cemeteries of the saints. But evermore carry God *in your hearts*. Nay, suffer not images to be *even in your private houses*. For it is *not lawful to lead a Christian man by his eyes*, but rather by the study or exercise of his mind."†

Q. When did images begin to be used in worship among Christians?

A. When the other things before mentioned were first copied from the Pagans. Yet this was so plainly contrary to the word of God, that the best men of the Church opposed it strongly. (St.) Epiphanius (two hundred and fifty years after the Apostles,) says in a letter to the Bishop of Jerusalem: "Travelling on a certain day to the holy place which is called Bethel, I came to the town named Anablatha, where as I was passing by, I saw a lamp burning, and asked what place it was. And being told that it was a church, I went in to pray. And there I found a vail hanging over the doors colored and painted, and having *an image as if of Christ or some saint*; for I do not well remember whose image it was. Therefore, when I saw this thing, *an image of a man hanging in the Church of Christ*, I TORE IT and told the wardens to wrap some pauper's dead body in it."‡ Erasmus (a very great scholar of the Roman communion) admits that "even to the times of St. Jerome there were men of approved piety who would suffer *no image, either graven or painted*, in the church, no, NOT EVEN THE PICTURE OF CHRIST; but by degrees the use of images crept into the churches."§

Q. When did this image-worship at last prevail?

A. It was decreed by the 2d Council of Nice, seven hundred years after the Apostles. Yet a great part of the Eastern Churches still resisted this monstrous de-

* De Fid. et Symb. c. 7, and De Cons. Ev. i. 10.

† As cited by IV. Council of Constant. Labb. viii. 1490.

‡ Op. ii. 317. Ed. Patav.

§ Op. v. 1187.

parture from pure religion. So, also, did a Council of bishops assembled by the Emperor Charlemagne, at Frankfort, and another Council at Grenada, in Spain. Still, such was now the influence of the popes in Western Europe, that as the Dark Ages grew darker, this idolatry finally prevailed in all that region. So in every Church of the Roman communion to this very day can be seen images and pictures, and persons bowing, kneeling, and saying prayers to them.*

Q. Were it for this idolatry alone, ought any Christian to remain in the Roman Church after reflecting on these facts?

A. No ; NOT FOR A MOMENT.



On Relics.

DOCTRINAL CATECHISM.

Q. In what manner do Catholics honor relics?

A. As precious remains, which bring to their remembrance distinguished sanctity, and as dear pledges, which animate their confidence in the communion and intercession of saints.

Q. Did the first Christians honor relics?

A. Certainly; and it is from them that we have learned to do so.

Q. Repeat St. Augustine's words—Epist. 103, ad Quint.

A. "I send you the relics of St. Stephen, to which pay due honor." St. Jerom wrote a whole book against Vigilantius, who was the first to deny honor to holy relics.

Q. Have relics any secret or interior power, or virtue?

* A Church which *permits* such things is very corrupt. But they are *defended* and *avored*. See Bull of Pius VI. 1794. *Auctor fidei*, Prop. 69-72. It is plain that this and saint-worship brought into the world the dreadful evil of Mohammed's false religion; which on the other hand has been giving way ever since the blessed Reformation.

A. No; but God has often granted great favors through them.

Q. Do Catholics adore or worship relics?

A. No; this would be rank idolatry. All Catholics can, with a safe conscience, say: "Cursed is he who commits idolatry, who prays to images or relics, or worships them for God."

Q. Has God himself honored relics, and through them wrought astonishing miracles?

A. Yes; the waters of the Jordan being struck by Eliseus with the *mantle* of Elias, suspended their course and afforded him a dry passage.—4 Kings 2 : 14, (Prot. ver. 2 Kings 2 : 14.) And, in the same chapter, verse 8th, the same astonishing prodigy was performed by the same means. Read the wonders performed by means of the *rod* of Moses, (Exod. 7.) See also 1 Kings, (*alias* Sam. 5,) and also Sam. 6 : 19, as to the wonders God was pleased to perform on account of the *Ark*, which was certainly a mere relic. See, also, 2 Kings, (*alias* Sam. 6 : 6, 7,) and 4 Kings, (*alias* 2 Kings 13 : 21,) where the *bones of the prophet Eliseus raised a dead man to life*.

Q. Are any such examples to be found in the New Testament?

A. Yes; many such—Matt. 9 : 20, 21. The woman troubled with an issue of blood for twelve years is cured by touching *the hem of our Saviour's garment*. In Matt. 14 : 36, as many as *touched the hem of his garment were made whole*. In Acts 19, the *handkerchiefs and aprons* which had *touched the body of St. Paul, removed diseases, and expelled devils*. In fine, the *shadow* of St. Peter healed multitudes that were sick and troubled with unclean spirits. (Acts 5 : 15, 16.)

Q. What inference do you draw from all this?

A. That Protestants show a lamentable ignorance of Scripture, when they rail against holy relics. If God has so honored them, and has wrought such wonderful miracles by them, as honored instruments, under both the Old and New Law, should not all Christians honor them; and may not those men be deemed wicked who despise the venerable instruments, used by the Almighty, to display the wonders of his power?

On Relics.

THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What is the law and custom of the Roman Church in regard to "relics"?

A. It is to treat with a sort of worship* any thing which is, *or is said to be*, a "relic" of some saint. Among such "relics," shown in various places, are pieces of the very cross on which our Lord died, *enough to make a hundred such! some of the coals that roasted (St.) Lawrence! parings from the toe-nails of (St.) Edmund! and the tail of the ass on which our Lord rode into Jerusalem!* Perhaps the most absurd instance of all, is the story, that the cottage in which St. Mary used to live at Nazareth, was, in the Dark Ages, carried by angels two thousand miles through the air, from the Holy Land to Italy, and at last set down in Loretto, not far from Rome, where it is to THIS VERY DAY visited and venerated by pilgrims from all parts of the world!†

Q. Were such customs in use among the first Christians?

A. There is not a word about "relics" in the Holy Scriptures, nor in any Christian writings for many years after the Apostles. Yet that was the very time when *genuine* relics might have been found, and more properly have been valued.

Q. How did this relic-worship begin?

A. Not more than a hundred years after the Apostles, the Christians began to preserve, with a sort of veneration, the dead bodies of holy men, especially if they had been murdered as martyrs of our Lord Christ. It shows the danger of all such practices, that by degrees, this veneration was given to every thing which was supposed to have belonged to such persons. At

* I myself have seen such things knelt to and otherwise *adored*, even in this country, and by quite intelligent persons.

† Baron. Annal.—An. ix.

last, in the Dark Ages, *false* "relics" were produced, and sold by thousands, and actual worship was given to them, as to this day, in the Roman Church.

Q. Have the Reformed Churches done well to reject all this ?

A. They surely have, as, to say the least, it tends to make the Church and religion ridiculous.

Q. What have the Ark, the mantle of Elijah, the woman cured by touching the hem of our Lord's garment, the shadow of St. Peter,* etc., to do with this relic-worship ?

A. Nothing whatever. These were various ways in which, as the Holy Scriptures tell us, God performed miracles in the days of old. *Therefore* I am to believe something which is shown to me to be the tail of the ass on which our Lord rode, and to treat it as very precious and holy !

Q. What further reason does the Roman Church give why these relics should be preserved and worshipped ?

A. That miracles are often performed through them. The Doctrinal Catechism reminds us how a dead man came to life when his body touched the bones of the prophet Elisha. This is another of the great miracles of the Scripture, which tells us that not long after the death of Elisha, another man being hastily buried in that great prophet's tomb, when the corpse, on being lowered down, touched his mouldering bones, the dead man came to life again. Did the people then take up these precious and wonderful "relics" of the prophet, and lay them up in a "reliquary" or "shrine," to be looked at and worshipped by the pious, as the Roman Church does now ; and to do other miracles ? No : it is plain, from the silence of Scripture, that they merely closed the tomb up again, and left it as they found it.† There is one plain and easy way for those who believe "relics" to have such miraculous power, to convince others. They have thousands of them in this country : *let them, then, fairly prove ONE SUCH MIRACLE.*

* As they consider *St. Peter's shadow* a "relic," (p.352.) it is a wonder they do not show it some where among other like treasures

† Read the account for yourself, in 2 Kings 13 : 20, 21.

On Pilgrimages.

DOCTRINAL CATECHISM.

Q. Is there any spiritual advantage to be derived from religious pilgrimages?

A. Yes; when they are performed in the spirit of true devotion.

Q. What can be the use of a pilgrimage to any particular place, since God is every where?

A. It is useful in this, that, though God is every where, some places are better calculated to excite devotion than others; for example, the scenes of any of the great wonders or triumphs of Christianity, the Shrine of SS. Peter and Paul, the Crib of Bethlehem, or the thrice holy soil of Mount Olivet or Mount Calvary.

Q. What succor does devotion find in a pilgrimage to such places?

A. We pray with more fervor, and are humbled more sensibly, when we find ourselves as grievous sinners wandering amongst the monuments of redemption.

Q. Can we glorify God by doing, for his honor, what he has not commanded?

A. Certainly; David—2 Kings 23 : 15–17—whilst he burned with an ardent thirst, poured forth the fresh water *as an offering to the Lord*; and, by this act of mortification, *which was not* commanded, he glorified God. The Blessed Virgin surely glorified God by her voluntary chastity, which was not commanded—(St. Luke, chap. 1.) St. Paul glorified God by the voluntary chastisement of his body—(1 Cor. 9.)

Q. Can you give us any Scriptural example of religious pilgrimages?

A. Elcana and Ann went every year to Silo to pray; and the Blessed Jesus and his Virgin Mother made a pilgrimage every year to Jerusalem to pray in the Temple. These surely are good and sufficient authorities.

On Pilgrimages.

THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Why do not the Reformed Churches practise pilgrimages as acts of religion?

A. Because they are a part of the same superstition with burning candles in daylight—blessing bells, eggs, etc.—holy water—Latin prayers—and images, pictures, and relics in worship. They were also, like most of these others, first imitated from the heathen, and are now practised even more by the Mohammedans and the pagan Hindoos.

Q. Was the going up to Shiloh or Jerusalem in use in the Jewish Church, and especially that of our Lord and his parents, any example for these pilgrimages?

A. No: They did this according to the plain command of God in his Old Law: "Three times in the year all thy males shall appear before the Lord God."* "And the man Elkanah and all his house went up to offer unto the Lord the yearly sacrifice."† So of the Lord Christ: "Now his parents went to Jerusalem every year at the feast of the Passover."‡ As for *his* Church, under the New Law, the Lord himself, so far from making *any place* specially sacred, said to the woman of Samaria: "Woman, believe me: the hour cometh when ye shall *neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem*, worship the Father. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth."§ That is,

* Ex. 23 : 17 : "Thrice a year shall all thy males appear before the Lord thy God."—Douay Bible.

† 1 Sam. 1 : 21 : "And Elcana, her husband, went up, and all his house, to offer to the Lord the solemn sacrifice and his vow."—Ib.

‡ Luke 2 : 41 : "And his parents went every year to Jerusalem at the solemn day of the Pasch."—Ib.

§ John 4 : 21-23 : "Woman, believe me, the hour cometh when you shall neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem adore the Father. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true adorer shall adore the Father in spirit and in truth. For the Father also seeketh such to adore him."—Ib.

“in the new light of religion all places are alike for the sincere worship of the unseen God, who is every where.”

Q. Is there any thing wrong in making journeys to the Holy Land, to see the places where our Lord, and the Prophets, and Apostles once lived?

A. *If one has money and leisure to travel, I know no places he may so well visit.* But there is no merit in this, and no more holiness gained, than may be by the poor man who must stay at home to do his humble duty.



On the Veneration of the ever-blessed Mother of Jesus.

CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Do Catholics adore the Blessed Virgin Mary as they adore God?

A. No, this would be idolatry; but Catholics honor her preëminent prerogatives with a degree of veneration *infinitely inferior* to that which is due to God, but much *superior* to that which is due to the angels and saints.

Q. Why honor her at all?

A. Jesus Christ himself (John 12 : 26) says, “If any man serve me, him will my Father honor;” surely, then, *even as God honors the Blessed Mary*, for no one served his Divine Son with so great fidelity, our veneration for her can not be misplaced. Even Dr. Pearson, a Protestant, (Exp. of Creed, p. 178,) says: “We can not bear too reverend a regard to the Mother of our Lord, *so long as we give her not that worship which is due unto the Lord himself.*”

Q. What do you discover so especially preëminent in the Blessed Virgin as to demand our especial veneration?

A. Immediately after the fall of man, the Almighty honors her by pointing her out, four thousand years be-

fore the event, as the person whose seed should crush the serpent's head. In Isaiah 8 : 13, she is made again the subject of a prophecy, and the sacred lips of the prophet of the Lord proclaim her virginity, a virtue which in all ages has obtained the first degree of honor.

Q. What do we find in Luke 1 : 26 ?

A. We find *she* is chosen of all the daughters of Eve to be the *Mother* of Jesus, the CHOICE is made by the ADORABLE TRINITY, and an ARCHANGEL announces the wonderful tidings to her.

Q. Is the heavenly message delivered by the Angel in such a manner as to give a strong proof of Mary's exalted dignity ?

A. Yes ; for she is addressed in language so respectful as to leave no doubt about the matter. "Hail !" says the Angel, "FULL OF GRACE, THE LORD IS WITH THEE : BLESSED ART THOU AMONGST WOMEN."

Q. What think you of those Protestants who call the Blessed Virgin an ordinary woman ?

A. We pity them, we tremble for them. An Archangel, bearing the words of the Adorable Trinity upon his tongue, tells them they are blasphemers of the saints of God. They utter a falsehood in the face of that exalted creature, a falsehood in the face of the Angel, nay, a falsehood in the very face of God himself.

Q. Do the above passages of Scripture exhibit her as an ordinary woman ?

A. No ; but the contrary. Is she an ordinary woman who is made *the subject of prophecy*, with whom the *Blessed Trinity communes*, to whom that Blessed Trinity delegates an ARCHANGEL MESSENGER, who is declared by the unerring lips of that Angel to be FULL OF GRACE, to have THE LORD WITH HER, and, of all the women of the earth, to be peculiarly BLESSED ?

Q. What should Protestants do to justify their language towards the Mother of God ?

A. They should corrupt their Bible a little more, and make the Angel say, "*Hail thou that art an ordinary woman, thou hast no grace, thou art not blessed more than others, the Lord is as much with the wives and daughters of the holy reforming ministers as he is with thee.*"

Q. What does Origen, who lived fourteen hundred years ago, say to our present purpose?

A. He says, "'Hail full grace,' etc., is a salutation addressed to MARY ALONE."

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What is perhaps the saddest error that could prevail in the Church?

A. When the adoring and loving piety of Christians is fixed upon any other person than God. We must not fancy that *he* is chiefly to be *feared* and *obeyed*; but that some other person may be more *loved* and *trusted in*. No; whether for "beauty of holiness," or for tender love and pity towards us, especially as these "shine in the face of Jesus Christ," no other person can compare with God or so much deserve our love. Therefore each of us should cry out to him: "Whom have I in heaven but thee?"* The "first and great commandment" is: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart."†

Q. Do any Christians in their very piety depart from this supreme love of God?

A. Yes, in the Roman Church, in the extravagant love and reverence that are given to the "saints," and especially to the blessed Mary, the virgin mother of our Lord. I entreat *all devout persons* who read this now, by the love of God, to consider fairly what I have to say, that they may not in the very warmth of their devotion disobey and dishonor "*Our Father who is in heaven.*"

Q. What proofs can you give that such false piety exists?

A. These among many other such things. I have before me now a book entitled "The Glories of Mary," printed at New-York in 1852, with the approval of

* Ps. 73 : 25 : "For what have I in heaven?"—Douay Bible.

† Mark 12 : 30 : "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart. This the first commandment."—Ib.

"John (Hughes) Archbishop of New-York." It was written by Alphonso de Liguori, who was enrolled at Rome as a "saint" in 1839, it being then declared by the Pope as a necessary condition of his being "canonized," that "*there is nothing censurable in any thing he has written.*" On the very second page of this book I find these words: "If Jesus is king of the whole world, Mary is also *queen* of the whole world; therefore, says St. Bernardine, of Sienna, *all creatures who serve God ought also to serve Mary*; for angels and men, and all things that are in heaven and on earth, being subject to the dominion of God, *are also subject to the dominion of the glorious Virgin.* Hence Gueric, abbot, thus addresses the *divine mother*: "Continue, Mary, continue in security to reign. *Dispose according to thy will of every thing belonging to thy Son*; for thou being mother and spouse of the King of the world, *the kingdom and power over all creatures is due to thee as QUEEN*"—and so on through this whole book of seven hundred and ninety pages. Here are some such sayings with which it is filled: "*All obey the commands of Mary, EVEN GOD HIMSELF.*" (P. 202.) "*MARY IS OMNIPOTENT, since the queen, by every law, must enjoy the same privileges as the king.*" (203.) "The prayer of Mary has the force of a *command* with Jesus Christ." (729.) Can any one honestly call this "a degree of veneration infinitely inferior to that which is due to God"? What shall we think of a Church which, so far from rebuking those who use such language as this, declares that "*there is nothing censurable in their writings,*" and proclaims them "saints," who are to be followed in their examples and even prayed to themselves?

Q. How should we regard St. Mary?

A. As one of the "holy women of old," especially happy and honored in being the mother of Jesus our Lord, *as he was man.*

Q. Did she, while living in this world among the first Christians, hold any office or title in the Church?

A. No, the Holy Scriptures tell us nothing of the kind. Her name is mentioned along with those of other Christian women without any distinction.

Q. When did any Christians first begin to call her "Queen of Heaven," "Queen of Angels," etc.?

A. Several hundred years afterwards, when the strange story of her "Assumption" (that is, of her never having died, but having been carried up alive into heaven and made *queen* there) was started.*

Q. What do the Scriptures say of Mary?

A. That there may be no mistake about this, I will give *every word* they use about her, and begin first with the Gospels. There are two accounts of our Saviour's birth and childhood, those of Sts. Matthew and Luke. Here is the former, with all that is said about his mother. "And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ." "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily. But while he thought on these things, behold the angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS, for he shall save his people from their sins. Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, *God with us*. Then Joseph being raised from sleep, did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife, and knew her not until she had brought forth her first-born son; and he called his name JESUS."† "And when they were come into

* Besides the Scriptures saying no such thing, and the absurdity of the story, (St.) Epiphanius proves to us that no such thing had been believed among Christians to his day, (three hundred years after the Apostles.) See Op. i. 1055.

† 1: 18-25: "Now the birth of Christ was thus: When Mary his mother was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost; whereupon Joseph her husband

the house, they saw the young child with Mary his mother, and fell down and worshipped him.”* “Arise, and take the young child and his mother,” etc. “When he arose, he took the young child and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt.”† “But when Herod was dead, behold an angel of the Lord appeareth in a dream to Joseph in Egypt, saying, Arise and take the young child and his mother, and go into the land of Israel, for they are dead which sought the young child’s life; and he arose and took the young child and his mother, and came into the land of Israel.”‡

Q. Is this all that St. Matthew in his account of the birth and childhood of Jesus our Lord, says of that Mary whom the “*saints*” Alphonsus, Bernardine, etc., call “queen,” “omnipotent,” etc.?

A. Yes, *every word*. St. Mark says *not one word*. Here is St. Luke’s account: “And in the sixth month the angel Gabriël was sent from God, unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin’s name was Mary. And the angel came in unto her and said, Hail, thou that art highly favored,§ the

being a just man, and not willing publicly to expose her, was minded to put her away privately. But while he thought on these things behold the angel of the Lord appeared to him in his sleep, saying, Joseph, son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins. Now all this was done that the word might be fulfilled which the Lord spoke by the prophet saying, Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us. And Joseph rising up from sleep, did as the angel of the Lord had commanded him, and took unto him his wife. And he knew her not till she brought forth her first-born son, and he called his name Jesus.”—Douay Bible.

* 2: 11: “And entering into the house, they found the child with Mary his mother, and falling down, they adored him.” (Ib.) We are not told they adored *her* or paid her any reverence.

† 2: 13, 14: “Arise and take the child and his mother, and fly into Egypt,” etc. “Who rising up, took the child and his mother by night and retired into Egypt.”—Ib.

‡ 19-21: “Now Herod being dead, behold an angel of the Lord appeared in sleep to Joseph in Egypt, saying, Rise and take the child and his mother and go into the land of Israel; for they are dead who sought the life of the child; who rising up took the child and came into the land of Israel.”—Ib.

§ The Roman Church in its translation puts “full of grace” for “highly favored.” It would be easy to *prove* to you that they are wrong in this. But judge for yourself from the whole passage which

Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women! And when she saw him, she was troubled at his saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be. And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found favor with God. And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and shalt bring forth a son, and shall call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David. And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end. Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the *Son of God*. And, behold, thy cousin Elizabeth, she hath also conceived a son in her old age, and this is the sixth month with her who was called barren; for with God nothing shall be impossible. And Mary said, Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word; and the angel departed from her. And Mary arose in those days, and went into the hill country with haste, into a city of Judea, and entered into the house of Zacharias, and saluted Elizabeth. And it came to pass that when Elizabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb. And Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost, and she spake out with a loud voice and said, Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. And whence is this to me that the mother of my Lord should come to me? For lo, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in my ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy. And blessed is *she that believed*, for there shall be a performance of those things which were told her from the Lord. And Mary said, My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God

is likely to be the wrong translation, and whether, even allowing the words "full of grace," they mean what that Church tries to make of them.

MY SAVIOUR. For he hath regarded *the low estate* of his handmaiden*; for, behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. For he that is mighty hath done to me great things, and holy is his name; and his mercy is on them that fear him from generation to generation. He hath showed strength with his arm. He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts. He hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree. He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich he hath sent empty away. He hath holpen his servant Israel in remembrance of his mercy, as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed forever. And Mary abode with her about three months, and returned to her own house.”†

* The Roman Church also mistranslates this, “humility.” As some of their own most learned men have said, (*Erasmus* and the Jesuit *Mal-donat*,) *a humble person would not speak of her own humility.*

† 1 : 26-56: “And the sixth month the Angel Gabriel was sent from God into a city of Galilee, called Nazareth, to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David, and the name of the virgin was Mary. And the angel being come in, said to her, Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee: Blessed art thou among women. And when she had heard, she was troubled at his saying, and thought with herself what manner of salutation this should be. And the angel said to her, Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found grace with God; behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the most High, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of David his father; and he shall reign in the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end. And Mary said to the angel, How shall this be done, because I know not man? And the angel answering, said to her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the most High shall overshadow thee. And therefore, also, the Holy Thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. And behold thy cousin Elizabeth, she hath also conceived a son in her old age, and this is the sixth month with her that is called barren; because no word shall be impossible with God. And Mary said, Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it done to me according to thy word. And the angel departed from her. And Mary rising up in those days went into the mountainous country with haste into a city of Juda; and she entered into the house of Zachary and saluted Elizabeth. And it came to pass that when Elizabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the infant leaped in her womb: and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost. And she cried out with a loud voice and said, Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. And whence is this to me that the mother of my Lord should come to me. For behold, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in my ears, the infant in my womb leaped for joy. And blessed art thou that hast believed; because those things shall be accomplished that were spoken to

Q. What do we learn of Mary from this account ?

A. That she was a most amiable, modest, and pious woman, chosen by God to be the mother of her and our Saviour, as "for us men and for our salvation" he should himself become a man. As such may "all generations call her blessed,"* and we study and follow the bright example of her life.

Q. Is it right on account of this to adore her ?

A. No more than to adore Moses because he was a holy man and God gave his first law by him.

Q. If St. Mary knows now that some persons on earth call her "Queen of heaven," etc., and make prayers to her, saying that they "fly to her protection," and calling upon her to save them, how must she feel ?

A. Greatly shocked and distressed at this false worship ; they who do this must seem to her rather to make her cursed than to "call her blessed."

Q. But the angel said to her, "Hail!" "the Lord is with thee," "Blessed art thou amongst women" ?

A. The word "Hail" was only a respectful salutation commonly used in those times, as by Judas when he betrayed the Lord, by the Roman soldiers when they mocked him, by the Council at Jerusalem in writing to the Christians of Antioch, etc. An angel also said to

thee by the Lord. And Mary said, My soul doth magnify the Lord ; and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour ; because he hath regarded the humility of his handmaid ; for, behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. For he that is mighty hath done great things to me and holy is his name. And his mercy is from generation to generation to them that fear him. He hath showed might in his arm ; he hath scattered the proud in the conceit of their heart. He hath put down the mighty from their seat, and hath exalted the humble. He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich he hath sent away empty. He hath received Israel his servant, being mindful of his mercy. As he spoke to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed forever. And Mary abode with her about three months, and she returned to her own house."—Douay Bible.

* There is nothing in this prophecy of St. Mary that requires us to even give her the *title* of "blessed," much less to worship her. We should regard her as the chief among blessed woman. There are several like expressions in the Scriptures about other persons. Leah, Jacob's wife, says : "*Happy am I, for the daughters will call me blessed.*" Gen. 30 : 13. It is said of "a virtuous woman," "*Her children arise up and call her blessed.*" (Prov. 31 : 28.) It is foretold of all the Christians, "*All nations shall call you blessed.*" (Mal. 3 : 12.)

Gideon : "The Lord is with thee."* Many persons and many kinds of persons are called "*blessed*" in the Scriptures, that word being used in this way *more than one hundred times*. It is even said by a prophet of one person : "*Blessed ABOVE women shall Jael the wife of Heber the Kenite be.*"† Shall we worship Gideon and Jael ?

CHAP. II.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What says Luke 1 : 35, on this question ?

A. "And the Angel answering, said unto her, (Mary,) *the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee* and the power of the *Most High shall overshadow thee* ; therefore also that *Holy Thing* which shall be born of thee shall be called the *Son of God.*"

Q. Does this passage prove the Blessed Virgin an ordinary woman ?

A. Oh ! blush for shame, ye reforming pretenders to Scriptural knowledge ! Is SHE an ordinary woman, who holds direct intercourse with the three persons of the Adorable Trinity ? She whose son is the Son of God ? she who is made the mother of the King of kings ? she whose son, as the angel tells her, shall be great, and shall be called the *Son of the Highest*, who shall *sit on the throne of David*, and *reign over the house of Jacob forever* ?

Q. Does she not, in verse 34, show some doubt, when she asks "How shall this be ? seeing that I know not man ?"

A. Yes ; but the moment that the angel tells her that the *Holy Ghost shall come upon her*—that all is to be the work of the Most High—she submits at once, and with the most edifying docility and humility exclaims : "Behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it done unto me according to thy word."

Q. Is there any thing in the 40th verse of same chapter to throw additional light on the exalted dignity of the Blessed Mary ?

* Judges 6 : 12 : "The Lord is with thee."—Douay Bible.

† This same "*blessed above women*," is said of *Judith*, in the book of that name, which the Roman Church calls a part of Scripture.

A. Yes ; at the *salutation* of Mary, *the babe leaped in Elizabeth's womb*, and *Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost*.

Q. Did Elizabeth, filled thus with the Holy Ghost, and bearing in her womb the Baptist, than whom none greater was ever born of woman—did Elizabeth, who was made by God miraculously fruitful—who knew, though not present at the angelic interview, what had passed between the angel and Mary—did this honored, exalted, and inspired Elizabeth agree with Presbyterians in thinking the Blessed Virgin an ordinary woman?

A. No ; she would have shuddered at such language. She proclaimed Mary's blessedness, and, though exalted herself, she considered herself highly honored by Mary's condescension in paying her a visit. "And Elizabeth spake out with a loud voice, and said, *Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb ; and whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me ?*"

Q. Is there any other proof, in this chapter, of Mary's preëminent dignity?

A. The poorest daughter of Eve is ennobled and exalted by becoming the mother of a king. How great, then, must be the dignity of Mary, who became the mother of the King of kings and Lord of lords ! And when we consider that Jesus could not dwell in an unholy tabernacle, how ineffably pure and exalted must Mary's spiritual state have been !!

Q. Does not this chapter suggest still some other proofs of her extraordinary and singular dignity ?

A. Yes ; she was troubled at the extraordinary nature of the angelic salutation ; but the Angel Messenger of the Most High calmed her fears, by declaring to her the exalted place she held in the estimation of the Most High. "*Fear not, Mary, thou hast found grace with God.*" But the circumstance which proclaims above all others her singular preëminence is, her maternity combined with virginity. She is a virgin, and yet a mother !!! This alone is sufficient to put to shame those unhappy men who seem to glory in reviling the blessed mother of their Redeemer, by proclaiming her, whose SON THEY ADORE, as an *ordinary woman*.

Q. What do we learn from Luke 1 : 18 ?

A. That the ever-exalted and blessed Mary is a prophetess. She declares of herself that all generations shall call her BLESSED ; and surely no one will be bold enough to say, that she, who was *full of grace*, and the temple of the *Holy Ghost*, could speak falsehood.

Q. What inference would you draw from this revealed truth ?

A. That Protestants belong not to the true people of God ; for they refuse to fulfill this prophecy. They glory in contemning the Blessed Virgin : they proclaim her an *ordinary woman*, instead of obeying the Scripture, which says : "*From henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.*"

Q. Does not the Blessed Jesus despise Mary, John 2 : 46, in these words, "Woman, what have I to do with thee?"

A. Yes, according to the corrupt Protestant translation ; but according to the Vulgate, which even the *Protestant Grotius* considers the SAFEST VERSION, our Saviour's words are, "*Woman, what is it to thee and to me ?*"

Q. Is the Protestant translation absurd and ridiculous as they understand it ?

A. Certainly ; for they would make our Saviour, whose *example* we are all bound to imitate, *despise and condemn his own mother*. She is honored by being asked with him to the marriage ; she was *familiar* with him previously, for she asks him to work a miracle, which she *clearly knows* he can perform. She does not seem hurt by the *apparent* refusal of Jesus. But the solution of the whole difficulty is found in the fact, that he works the very miracle requested by Mary immediately after. Thus, he works his *first miracle* at the suggestion of Mary. In Luke 2 : 49-51, he treats her with the greatest respect ; he forgets her not, when, even hanging on the cross in the agony of death, he commends her with his last breath to the care of his beloved disciple ; and yet, after all this, Protestants would make us believe that he despised her, and treated her with studied contempt at the marriage-feast of Cana !!

Q. What would you say to the difficulty, if the Protestant translation was correct?

A. He sometimes acted in his character as God, and sometimes as man, and, on this occasion, he wished to manifest that, as God, he knew their wants and would relieve them, in the same manner as, on another occasion, he said to Mary, "*Didst thou not know that I should be about my Father's business?*"

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Does St. Luke relate any thing then of the *childhood* of our Lord which shows that "Mary is queen of the whole world as he is king," and so "her prayers are the same as commands to the Lord"?

A. Here is every word of this in which he mentions her. "And Joseph also went up from Galilee, etc., to be taxed, with Mary his espoused wife, being great with child. And so it was that while they were there, the days were accomplished that she should be delivered, and she brought forth her first-born son, and wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a manger, because there was no room for them in the inn." "And they came with haste, and found Mary and Joseph, and the babe lying in a manger." "But Mary kept all these things and pondered them in her heart." "And when the days of her purification according to the law of Moses were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord." "And he (Simeon) came by the Spirit into the temple; and when the parents brought in the child Jesus to do for him after the custom of the law, then took he him up in his arms and blessed God and said, Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace according to thy word; for mine eyes have seen thy salvation which thou hast prepared before the face of all people; a light to lighten the Gentiles and the glory of thy people Israel. And Joseph and *his mother marvelled* at those things which were spoken of him. And Simeon blessed

them, and said unto Mary his mother, Behold this child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel, and for a sign which shall be spoken against: yea a sword shall pierce through thy own soul also, that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed."

"And when they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee to their own city Nazareth. And the child grew and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon him. Now his parents went to Jerusalem every year at the Feast of the Passover. And when he was twelve years old they went up to Jerusalem after the custom of the Feast; and when they had fulfilled the days, as they returned, the child Jesus tarried behind in Jerusalem, and Joseph and his mother knew not of it. But they supposing him to have been in the company, went a day's journey, and they sought him among his kinsfolk and acquaintance. And when they found him not, they turned back again to Jerusalem seeking him. And it came to pass, that after three days they found him in the Temple sitting in the midst of the doctors both hearing them and asking them questions. And all that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers. And when they saw him *they were amazed*. And his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? behold, *thy father* and I have sought thee sorrowing. And he said unto them, *How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be about MY FATHER'S business?* And they understood not the saying which he spake unto them. And he went down with them and came to Nazareth and was subject unto them. But his mother kept all these sayings in her heart."*

* Luke 2 : 4-7, 16, 19, 22, 27-35, 39-51 : "And Joseph also went up from Galilee, etc., to be enrolled with Mary his espoused wife, who was with child. And it came to pass that when they were there, her days were accomplished that she should be delivered. And she brought forth her first-born son, and wrapped him up in swaddling clothes and laid him in a manger: because there was no room for them in the inn." "And they came with haste and they found Mary and Joseph and the infant lying in a manger." "But Mary kept all these words, pondering them in her heart." "And after the days of her purification according

Q. From this, which completes every word of the Scriptures about Mary during the childhood of our Lord, (St. John's gospel says *nothing* about either his birth or childhood,) how did he plainly treat her and she regard him?

A. He commonly showed himself only as a human child and was then obedient both to her and her husband Joseph. But when, as with the doctors in the temple, he acted as the one who came down from heaven, he spoke to her with majestic authority, as merely one of those he came to save. And all the time she wonders at and reverences, but does not understand her child.

Q. Yet if we *are* to venerate her and call upon her in our prayers we shall certainly find the gospels full of her name and great reverence given to her in the account of our Lord's life after he began to preach. How is it in St. Matthew's Gospel?

to the law of Moses were accomplished, they carried him to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord." "And he came by the Spirit into the temple. And when his parents brought in the child Jesus, to do for him according to the custom of the law, he also took him into his arms and blessed God, and said: Now thou dost dismiss thy servant, O Lord, according to thy word, in peace; because my eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before the face of all people: a light to the revelation of the Gentiles and the glory of thy people of Israel. And his father and mother were wondering at these things which were spoken concerning him; and Simeon blessed them; and said to Mary his mother: Behold this child is set for the ruin and for the resurrection of many in Israel and for a sign which shall be contradicted: And thy own soul a sword shall pierce, that out of many hearts thoughts may be revealed." "And after they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee to their own city Nazareth. And the child grew and waxed strong, full of wisdom; and the grace of God was in him. And his parents went every year to Jerusalem at the solemn day of the pasch. And when he was twelve years old, they went up to Jerusalem according to the custom of the feast. And after they had fulfilled the days, when they returned, the child Jesus remained in Jerusalem; and his parents knew it not. And thinking that he was in the company, they came a day's journey, and sought him among their kinsfolks and acquaintance. And not finding him, they returned into Jerusalem, seeking him. And it came to pass that after three days, they found him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, hearing them and asking them questions. And all that heard him were astonished at his wisdom and his answers. And seeing him they wondered. And his mother said to him, Son, why hast thou done so to us? Behold thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing. And he said to them, How is it that you sought me? did you not know that I must be about the things that are my Father's? And they understood not the word that he spoke unto them. And he went down with them and came to Nazareth; and was subject to them. And his mother kept all these words in her heart."—Douay Bible.

A. Here is every word about her. "While he yet talked to the people, behold *his mother* and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him. Then one said unto him, Behold thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee. But he answered and said unto him that told him, *Who is my mother?* and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said, *Behold MY MOTHER and my brethren.* For *whosoever shall do the will of my Father who is in heaven, the same is my brother and sister and MOTHER.*"* "Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren James, and Joses, and Simeon, and Judas? and his sisters, are they not all with us?"†

Q. What! is nothing more than this said of her in St. Matthew's Gospel?

A. *Not one word.* She is not even mentioned by him as present at the crucifixion, *though the two other Marias are.* But what *is* said shows that he, the Lord and Saviour of the world could have no very special regard for her more than for his other disciples.

Q. What is said of her in St. Mark's Gospel?

A. "There came then his brethren and his *mother*, and standing without, sent unto him, calling him. And the multitude sat about him; and they said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren without seek thee. And he answered them saying, *Who is my mother* or my brethren? And he looked around about on them which sat about him and said, *Behold my mother and my brethren.* For *whosoever shall do the will of God,*

* Matt. 12: 46-50: "As he was yet speaking to the multitudes, behold his mother and his brethren stood without, seeking to speak to him. And one said to him, Behold thy mother and thy brethren stand without, seeking thee. But he answering him that told him said, *Who is my mother and who are my brethren?* And stretching forth his hand toward his disciples, he said, Behold my mother and my brethren. For whosoever shall do the will of my Father who is in heaven, he is my brother and sister and mother."—Douay Bible.

† 13: 55, 56: "Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary; and his brethren James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Jude? And his sisters, are they not all with us?"—Ib.

the same is my brother and sister and MOTHER."* "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary," etc.?†

Q. Is that all St. Mark (who is supposed to have written under the special direction of St. Peter) says of her?

A. Yes, that is *every word about her in his gospel from beginning to end.*

Q. What does St. Luke relate of her beside what has been already given? (See pp. 369, etc.)

A. "Then came to him his *mother* and his brethren, and could not come at him for the press. And it was told him by certain which said, Thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to see thee. And he answered and said unto them, My *mother* and my brethren are those which hear the word of God and do it."‡ "And it came to pass as he spake these things a *certain woman of the company* lifted up her voice and said, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked! But *he* said, Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it."§

Q. Is this all that St. Luke says of her?

A. Yes, *every word.*

Q. What does St. John say of St. Mary, the mother of our Lord, in his gospel?

A. "And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee, and the mother of Jesus was there. And both Jesus was called and his disciples to the marriage.

* 3 : 31-35: "And his mother and his brethren came and standing without, sent to him calling him : and the multitude sat about him ; and they say to him : Behold thy mother and thy brethren without seek for thee. And answering them he said : Who is my mother and my brethren? And looking round on them who sat about him, he saith, Behold my mother and my brethren. For whosoever shall do the will of God, he is my brother and my sister and mother."—Douay Bible.

† 6 : 3: "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary," etc.—Ib.

‡ 8 : 19-21: "And his mother and brethren came to him ; and they could not come at him for the crowd. And it was told him, Thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to see thee. And he answered and said to them : My mother and my brethren are they who hear the word of God and do it."—Ib.

§ 11 : 27, 28: "And it came to pass as he spoke these things, that a certain woman from the crowd, lifting up her voice, said to him : Blessed is the womb that bore thee and the paps that gave thee suck. But he said, Yea, rather blessed are they who hear the word of God and keep it."—Ib.

And when they wanted wine, the mother of Jesus saith unto him, They have no wine. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come. His mother saith unto the servants, Whatsoever he saith unto you do it," etc.* (She is not mentioned again in the account of this miracle.) "After this, he went down to Capernaum, he and his mother and his disciples."† "Now there stood by the cross of Jesus, his mother and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene. When Jesus therefore saw his mother and the disciple standing by whom he loved, he saith unto his mother, Woman, behold thy son. Then saith he to the disciple, Behold thy mother, and from that hour that disciple took her to his own home."‡

Q. Is that all St. John (her adopted son by the Lord's own dying injunction) says of her? Are you sure that in neither of the gospels our Lord himself, or at least some one, does not call her "Queen of Heaven," etc., or tell men to ask her to plead with him for them, or to say, "Hail Mary," etc., in their prayers? Are you sure of this?

A. The above is all that is said of her in St. John's Gospel from beginning to end. No one has ever pretended to find any thing else about her, in any of the gospels, than I have given.§ The Roman Church indeed alters the words, "What have I to do with thee?" (John 2 : 4,) to "*What is it to me and to thee?*" But

* 2 : 1-5 : "And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee; and the mother of Jesus was there. And Jesus also was invited and his disciples to the marriage. And the wine failing, the mother of Jesus saith to him, They have no wine. And Jesus saith to her : Woman, what is that to me and to thee? my hour is not yet come. His mother saith to the waiters : Whatsoever he shall say to you, do ye."—Douay Bible.

† 2 : 12 : "After this, he went down to Capernaum, he and his mother, and his brethren and his disciples."—Ib.

‡ 19 : 25-27 : "Now there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother and his mother's sister Mary of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene. When Jesus therefore saw his mother and the disciple standing whom he loved, he saith to his mother : Woman, behold thy son. After that he saith to the disciple, Behold thy mother. And from that hour the disciple took her to his own."—Ib.

§ Yet the Doctrinal Catechism assures us (p. 379) that "she received into her arms his mangled and bloody body," etc. "She sought him early on the morning of the Resurrection," etc. It does not find this knowledge in the word of God.

every scholar knows that this last is the *Greek way* of saying the former, which translated word for word makes nonsense in English, as we see here. *The Roman Church translates these same Greek words just as we do in another place.**

Q. What then must we judge of the mother of our Lord from what the gospels say?

A. That she was indeed a blessed woman; but that he, foreseeing what men would do in after-times, took especial care to neither say nor do any thing which would encourage them in worshipping his human mother. You see *he* never even *calls her his "mother."* But besides, he gave them plain *warnings against* this, as in the answer he made to the good woman who, hearing him preach, cried out, (like some pious people in our days,) "*Blessed is the womb that bare thee,*" etc., (see p. ,) and also in the story of his mother's coming to see him once while he was preaching; when, instead of stopping to receive her and to commend her to the reverence of the people, he only looks around on his hearers and says, "*Behold my mother and my brethren. He that heareth the word of God and keepeth it, the same is my brother and sister and mother;*" that is, "*All those, and only those, who follow me are alike near and dear to me.*" Remember that *this is related in three of the gospels out of the four*; while the visit of the angel, etc., of which the Doctrinal Catechism makes so much, is related in only *one*. It is also worth noticing, that while other good women are spoken of in the gospels as going about with our Lord in the company of his disciples in all his journeys, *his mother never is*, except on his return from the marriage at Cana. She seems rather to have usually remained at home, as appears also from her *visiting* him as above.

Q. If we ought to give any sort of worship to Mary, we shall certainly find the holy Apostles and first Christians doing so after the Ascension of our Lord into heaven. What mention is made of her in the Acts of the Apostles?

A. "These all continued with one accord in prayer

* Luke 8:28: "And crying out with a loud voice, he said: *What have I to do with thee?*"—Douay Bible.

and supplication with the women, and with Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren.”*

Q. *What!* is there no other mention of her in the book of Acts? no veneration of her? no account of her life, or of her departure from this world?

A. *None whatever.*

Q. What is said of her then in the Epistles, those divine letters of the Apostles to the Churches, in which true religion is so fully taught?

A. *Nothing whatever.*

Q. What then in the Apocalypse or Revelation of St. John which closes the Book of God?

A. *Nothing*; her name is not mentioned in it at all.

Q. But if we find nothing in the word of God† for calling her “Queen of heaven,” etc., should we do this, (or *may* we,) because she was the mother of Jesus our Lord?

A. No; she is simply that creature whom he chose to honor with his human birth; one of the very sinners whom he came to save. She herself, even when her soul was first filled with adoring gratitude for this honor, would have been pierced through with sorrow, if she had foreseen that this very favor of God to her would be used by men to take part of his worship and glory from him and give it to her. God made use of and honored her in this, just as he did the patriarch Joseph to save the Israelites alive, Moses to give the first law, and Paul to preach the Gospel.

Q. Can you give another proof that Mary’s being the human mother of our Lord does not make it right for us to give her any sort of worship?

A. Yes, this; that the same thing would apply to *all* his human forefathers, and especially to David, the great king of Israel. “*Son of David*,” is one of the

* 1 : 14: “All these were persevering with one mind in prayer with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus, and his brethren.”—Douay Bible.

† As the New Testament is so plain about this, it is hardly worth the while to notice the pretended proofs brought by the Doctrinal Catechism from the Old. Evidently Mary is *not* mentioned at all in the first promise of redemption. It is only said that the seed of the woman (that is, of Eve, or of the female sex) shall bruise the serpent’s head. And Isaiah prophesies only, “Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son,” and makes no other mention of the mother.

Lord's high titles of honor, (never, "*son of Mary* ;") yet no one invokes David, or implores him to soften the heart of his great-great-great-grandchild, Jesus, or gives him the title of *Ancestor of God*. O good-people! you who while devoutly given to serve God in good works, have before now supposed that 'the way to Jesus was through the heart of Mary,' you can no longer think this: the word of God is too plain against it. While in all the words of holy St. Peter you will find nothing about *her*, he *did say this of JESUS*: "*Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.*"* Go to him then *directly* in your hearts. He will forgive your past mistakes because you really thought you were thus doing him service. So when we meet with the blessed Virgin and other saints in heaven we shall find that we were all alike saved alone by Christ our Almighty Lord.

CHAP. III.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What says St. Augustine (Serm. on the Announ.) as to the dignity of the Blessed Virgin?

A. "By what praises, O sacred Virgin, I may extol thee I know not, since thou hast been deemed worthy to bear in thy womb Him whom the heavens are unable to contain."

Q. What says St. Epiphanius, Adv. Hæres. Lib. iii. F. 2?

A. "Truly life itself was *introduced into the world* by the Virgin Mary, . . . Eve brought to the human race the cause of death, . . . Mary brought the cause of life."

Q. Is the Greek schismatical Church one with the Catholic Church on this head?

A. Photius, its great leader, speaks thus, (Serm. de Nativ. :) "But you, O Blessed Virgin, and also Mother

* Acts 4 : 12: "Nor is there salvation in any other. For there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved."—Douay Bible.

of the eternal Lord, our propitiation and refuge, *inceding for us with your Son and our God*, . . . vouchsafe to render us your panegyrists." See Counc. of Ephesus and Nice, Act 6.

Q. Is the veneration of the Blessed Virgin an ancient practice in the Church?

A. It can owe its origin only to the Apostles, for it can be traced to no later age; no man, no body of men, no country, can be pointed out as having originated it; hence, it is evidently Apostolical, and, consequently, it has the authority of heaven.

Q. What general conclusion would you draw from all that we have said?

A. That Protestants, in their contempt for the Blessed Virgin, resist the irresistible evidence of their own Bible. They talk of her as an ordinary woman, whilst, in a flood of heavenly light, she shines the most singularly preëminent personage that ever was created. God himself makes honorable mention of her at the very dawn of the world; the prophet Isaiah, centuries before the event, proclaims her the illustrious Virgin Mother of the future Messiah; an *all-wise Deity* selects *her*, of all the daughters of Eve, to be the Mother of the Redeemer; the *Blessed Trinity* sends an *Archangel* to obtain her consent; she is saluted as *full of grace*; she is assured that the *Lord is with her*; that *she is blessed* among women; that the *Holy Ghost* will come upon her; that the *Most High* will overshadow her; that *her son* shall be called the *Son of God*; that she has found grace with God; that, though a *virgin*, she shall conceive the Son of God, at once a *VIRGIN* and a *MOTHER!!!* At the sound of her voice, the infant Baptist *leaps in his mother's womb*, and his mother is filled with the Holy Ghost. The inspired Elizabeth salutes Mary in the very words of the Angel, "*Blessed art thou among women*;" and this blessed Mary herself bursts forth in the spirit of prophecy, and foretells that *all generations shall call her blessed*; and all generations, during fifteen hundred years, did so, and seven eighths of Christianity do so at the present day.

Q. It does appear strange, that Protestants will despise her, whom

God has so preëminently sanctified and exalted—have you any additional considerations which may have a tendency to make them blush for their rash and unscriptural conduct?

A. Yes; many. For nine months did the Blessed Mary carry our Redeemer in her thrice holy womb; she suffered with him at the crib of Bethlehem; wept over his infant body, and wiped away his tears; she sorrowed when he bled in the temple; fled with him to Egypt; tended him during youth; and was sanctified by his divine companionship during thirty-three years. She was the companion of all his sorrows, sufferings, and tortures; her soul was transfixed by every wound he received; her tears were mingled with every drop of blood which he shed; a living monument of grief, she was found at the foot of the cross, when all had abandoned him. In the dying struggle of Jesus, we find her his anxious care; with his dying breath he commends her to the affectionate tenderness of his beloved disciple. She receives into her arms his mangled and bloody body, and sorrowed with those who laid him in the tomb; she sought him early on the morning of the Resurrection, and was found among his Apostles on the day of his Ascension and on the day of Pentecost; and even all this is not sufficient to induce *wise* and *religious* Protestants to regard with respect and veneration the Mother of Jesus!

Q. What should Catholics do in a country where torrents of blasphemous insults are every day poured forth against the Mother of God by men calling themselves Christian ministers?

A. They should have ever on their lips the sweet address of the Archangel Messenger, thus paraphrased by the holy Athanasius fourteen hundred years ago: "Be mindful of us, O Blessed Virgin! Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee! Thee, the angelical and terrestrial hierarchies proclaim blessed. Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. O mistress, lady, intercede for us! Queen, and Mother of God, pray for us!"

CHAP. III.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What is the actual religion of the Roman Church in regard to Mary?

A. It not only offers prayers to her which, as we have already seen (page 138, etc.) is wrong in regard to any saint, but in fact generally gives her as much, and even more worship than to the One God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. That Church does not formally *avow* this, and no doubt many of its members will truly deny it of themselves with horror. But what I say is, that such is the religion of much the greater part in that Church; and I have *five great proofs* to give of this.

Q. What is the first?

A. In their private devotions with the "rosary" they call upon Mary *ten times*, when they do upon God *once*.

Q. What is the second?

A. In their favorite *books of devotion*, recommended by their bishops, as, "The Glories of Mary," "True Piety," "The Garden of the Soul," etc., etc., the prayers are chiefly addressed to her, and (while they admit her to be a creature) are yet in such terms as, to say the least, put her on a level with our Lord. Here is by no means the strongest instance of this: "Hail, *daughter of God the Father*; Hail, *mother of God the Son*; Hail, *spouse of God the Holy Ghost*; Hail, temple of the whole Trinity. Thanks be to God *and to Mary*! May all things be to the eternal glory of the most Holy Trinity *and of the immaculate Mary*!"*

Q. What is the third proof?

A. That in these writings of "saints" in that Church, which has made itself responsible for what they say, by declaring that "they have written nothing censurable,"

* Glories of Mary, page 785.

and "canonizing" them, Mary is not only presented to men to be adored, but as *our real Saviour*, and to be *more loved* than our Blessed Redeemer, Christ Jesus, who shed his blood for us! "The Glories of Mary," says, (with a hundred other like things,) "He who has not recourse to thee, O Lady, will not reach Paradise," (page 256.) "The Eternal Father has given to *the Son* the office of judging and punishing; and to the *mother* the office of *compassionating and relieving the wretched.*" The blasphemous falsehood of this can be fully seen only by reflecting that, while the Word of God says nothing of this kind about Mary, it does say that, "God so loved the world that he gave his Only Begotten Son, that *whosoever believeth on him* should not perish, but have everlasting life."* Yet those Roman "*saints*" would have us only *fear* the Royal and Blessed Son of God *our Saviour*—and *LOVE his Mother!* Of course, where men have several objects of worship, they will adore and serve most the one they *love* most.

Q. What is the fourth proof of this?

A. That the common way of representing our Lord at Rome itself, and to a great degree every where in the Roman Church, is as an infant in the arms of his mother, thus giving the notion of dependence and obedience on his part, and of higher dignity and authority on hers. Nay, more, this pushes aside the thought of all he did for us *as a man*, and of his being our great King, now in heaven. You have seen all that the Scriptures say of the birth and childhood of Jesus, and that there is nothing like this in them. *Two of the Gospels* say *nothing* of our Lord before he was a grown man; and in the others what is told of his earlier life is *not one twentieth part* of the whole. But no: to exalt Mary, we must have "the infant Jesus," instead of the God and "*man* Christ Jesus."

Q. What is the fifth proof?

* John 3 : 16 : "God so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son; that whosoever believeth in him may not perish, but may have life everlasting."—Douay Bible.

A. The Roman Church in its public worship, and otherwise, mimics the great *facts* of our Lord's life, and the festivals which celebrate them by corresponding *fables* and festivals of Mary, and gives his titles to her also. Here they are, side by side with the former :

March 25th, Anunciation, etc., or Incarnation of our Lord.	December 8th, "Immaculate Conception" of Mary.
December 25th, Christmas—the Birth of our Lord.	September 8th, Birth of Mary.
February 2d, Presentation of the Infant Jesus in the Temple.	November 21st, Presentation of the infant Mary in the Temple.
(Fortieth day after Easter,) Ascension of our Lord into heaven.	August 15th, Assumption of Mary into heaven.

There is this difference between these, that those of our Lord are related in the Word of God, while *there is nothing about the others there*: they are fables of the Dark Ages. For instance, to exalt Mary, the story was invented, that when she died she was carried, *body and soul*, by angels, to heaven, where she was received with great applause, and crowned as Queen: this is the "Assumption" of Mary, to correspond to the Ascension of Jesus. So also, because our Lord was born without sin, we have the fable, that "Anna," her mother, (*Scripture* does not even give the *name* of Mary's mother,) conceived *her* without sin, so that *she* never had a taint of original sin. This last story is indeed the latest of all, and was only finally agreed upon by the *unchangeable* Roman Church four years ago.* Most of the Scriptural titles of our Lord and God are also given to her, as "Advocate," "Mediator," "Intercessor," etc. (St.) Bonaventure published what he called the "Psalter of Our Lady," in which all the Psalms of David are given, with the name of Mary put in place

* Even "Milner's End of Controversy" made this admission a few years ago. (Let. 12.) "The Church does not decide the controversy concerning *the conception of the Blessed Virgin*, and several other disputed points, because *she sees nothing absolutely clear and certain* concerning them, *either in the written or the unwritten word*; and therefore leaves her children to *form their own opinions* concerning them." Yet this is the *unchangeable* Church which (see page 202,) "tells clearly in what sense all ambiguous portions of God's Word are to be understood." It is a curious but certain fact, that the earliest hint we have of this notion of "the Immaculate Conception" is in the Koran of Mohammed.

of that of God! as in the 95th Psalm: "*O come, let us sing unto OUR LADY!*" etc.

Q. Is not the Roman Church responsible for this?

A. Yes, if it were only that it does not rebuke this extravagant, fanatical, and even blasphemous idolatry in any of its members. But it is its very pastors and "saints" that say and do such things.

Q. When did this worship of Mary begin?

A. There is no mention of her by any title of honor, not even as the "Blessed," (though (St.) Ignatius speaks of the "blessed *Judith*,") in the writings of those who knew any of the Apostles. (See page 86.) A great veneration for "saints," among whom Mary was reckoned, began within two hundred years after the Apostles. But nothing like *this* was known until a hundred years later, when a sect arose which taught the worship of Mary; and here is what (St.) Epiphanius says of them: "I acknowledge that Mary remained ever a virgin, but *she never was proposed to us as an object of worship*, since she herself worshipped him who was born of her flesh, but who had descended from heaven, and the bosom of the Father. Wherefore *the sacred Gospel also admonishes us*, in which Christ saith, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee? My hour is not yet come.' Here he calls her 'Woman,' lest any one should suppose her to be of a superior nature; and he used this word as if prophesying for the refutation of those heretics who he knew would arise in the world; that no one should be led away by too great admiration of the holy Virgin, to adopt these puerile follies. Wherefore, truly, let Mary be honored, but let the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost be worshipped. LET NO ONE WORSHIP MARY."*

With this agree all the great "Fathers." Look at the pretended proofs from them which the Doctrinal Catechism gives. Not one passage which is genuine

* Op. tom. i. 1061-64. Compare this with these words of Pope Pius IX., in the Bull *Ineffabilis*, 1853. "Let all the children of the Catholic Church, etc., proceed to *worship, invoke, and pray to* the Most Blessed Virgin Mary," etc.—Bryant's Defense of the Immac. Conc., 293.

means the Roman doctrine; and the others are scandalous forgeries. Such, for instance, are the pretended words of Athanasius, at the end of the chapter. Yet this worship of Mary, springing from the old pagan notion of "goddesses," and helped by the fancy (so shockingly out of place when it intervenes in and corrupts the worship of the blessed God) of a gallant devotion to the female sex, increased by degrees, until it prevailed in the Church in the Dark Ages. Oh! you honest Christians who have been brought up in the Roman Church, consider that it is not too much to say of much that is allowed, and even favored, among you, that it is altogether *another religion* than that of the New Testament; that it is *not Christian*, but *Marian*. St. Paul speaks of some who "worshipped and served the *creature* more than the *Creator*, who is God over all blessed for evermore."

Q. What must we say of the ranting rhapsodies of the last chapter of the Doctrinal Catechism—its italic, and capital letters, and exclamation points?

A. They are, perhaps, as good arguments for such monstrous idolatry in a Christian Church, as could be used.



On Persecution.

DOCTRINAL CATECHISM.

Q. Is persecution, on account of religious belief, a tenet of the Catholic religion?

A. Certainly not. Although some Catholics are said to have persecuted, if matters are carefully examined, it will be found, that, in some instances, the persecutions arose out of the wicked spirit of revenge, and in others, that it was not religious opinion which was persecuted, but gross moral and political crimes. If Catholics have ever been guilty of persecution, the crime was their own, not that of their religion.

Q. Did Protestants persecute Catholics?

A. Yes; in every country where the Reformed doctrines were received, Catholics were persecuted. C. Peterson Hooft, a Protestant, reproaches his Protestant countrymen of Holland thus: "Actuated by a hatred of cruelty, you rush yourselves into acts of cruelty; no sooner have you secured your freedom than you wish to tyrannize over others."—Hist. Reform. Ger. Brand., t. i. p. 333. Knox commenced the Reformation in Scotland, by being a party to the murder of Cardinal Beatoun. (Tytler's Hist. of Scotland.) In 1560, the Parliament established the Presbyterian religion, and ordered all the professors of the ancient faith to be punished with death. "With such indecent haste," says Robertson, "did the very persons, who had just escaped ecclesiastical tyranny, proceed to imitate the example." In 1596, the Presbytery, writing to the King and Council concerning the Earls of Huntly, Errol, etc., say that, "as they had been guilty of idolatry, a crime deserving of death, the civil power could not spare them."

Q. Did the French Protestants persecute?

A. They rebelled against their sovereign, prohibited the Catholic religion, murdered the priests and religious, burnt the churches and convents, and dug up the dead to make bullets of their leaden coffins. (Maimbourg, Thuanus, Hist. Calv., Lib. 31.) Nic. Fromenteau, a Protestant, confesses, that in Dauphiné alone, they killed two hundred and fifty-six priests, and one hundred and twelve monks or friars. In these atrocities, the Protestant Baron des Adrets forced Catholic prisoners to jump from the towers upon the pikes of his soldiers, and obliged *his own children to wash their hands in the blood of Catholics*. (Liv. de Finance.)

Q. Did Protestant England persecute Catholic Ireland?

A. Dr. Curry has preserved, amongst many other martyrs, the names of twenty-seven priests, who suffered death on account of their religion. (Hist. of Civil Wars in Ireland, vol. i. p. 8.) See Spondanus and Pagi on the martyrdom of F. O'Hurle, the Catholic

Archbishop of Cashel, a sanguinary deed, perpetrated by Sir W. Drury. See also Bourke's *Hibernia Domini-cana*, where the number of Irish martyrs, and the dreadful deaths they died, are given in detail.

Q. Did not the Duke of Alva boast, that, in the Low Countries, he had delivered eighteen thousand heretics to the executioners?

A. These *heretics* should have been called *rebels*, since, according to the Protestant writer Brand, they had conspired against the life of the Duke, then Spanish governor, and put to death, in cold blood, all the priests and religious they could lay their hands upon. See Brand, *Hist. Reform. des Pays Bas*. Feller, *Hist. Dict. art. Toledo*, says, that Vandermerk slaughtered more un-offending Catholic priests and peasants in 1572, than Alva executed Protestants during his whole government. See, also, on this subject, Mons. Kerroux, *L'Abregé de l'Hist. de la Hollande*.

Q. Did not the 4th Lateran Council, in 1215, expressly ordain the persecution of heretics?

A. In the first place, Matthew of Paris (ad dict. ann) denies that the supposed persecuting Canon was the act of that Council; 2dly, even Dupin, who was more Protestant than Catholic, tom. x. p. 104, says, "It is certain that this chapter (the persecuting Canon) is not the work of the Council;" 3dly, the learned Protestant, divine, Collier, *Eccl. Hist.*, vol. i. p. 424, declares, that the Canon in question "is spurious;" 4thly, supposing this Canon to be genuine, it was framed for a particular case, and not by the Ecclesiastical part of the Council alone, but by all the sovereigns of Europe, who were present at the Council, either by themselves or by their ambassadors.

Q. For what particular class of heretics was this Canon adopted?

A. It was framed to check the horrible brutalities of the Albigenses, who taught that there were two Gods—one good, and the other evil—that no one could be saved in a married state; that unnatural gratifications should be substituted for those of marriage; that no kind of flesh meat could be used without sin; they threw the Scriptures into the common sewers, and profaned horribly even the sacred vessels of the Altar.

All these, and many other dreadful impieties, they openly taught and practised, so that even Mosheim, *Ecel. Hist.* vol. iii. says: "Their shocking violation of decency was a consequence of their pernicious system; they looked upon modesty and decency as marks of inward corruption." Such were the men so often pitied by Protestants as a persecuted race. See Limborch. *Hist. of Inquis.* See also Bossuet's *Var.*

Q. Did not the Council of Constance persecute Wyckliff?

A. He was treated very mercifully; notwithstanding his *seditions* and impious doctrines, he was left unpunished during his whole life. Dr. Fiddes, *Life of Cardinal Wolsey*, pp. 38, 39, Protestant as he was, says, "It was not for their *speculative* opinions that the followers of Wyckliff were punished, but because they maintained opinions derogatory to the rights of princes, injurious to society, and contrary to law;" and Archb. Parker says: "The laws against them *were necessary* on account of the *tumults* they occasioned."

Q. What were these impious and seditious doctrines of Wyckliff? were they such as to deserve prosecution?

A. He taught, 1st, that one mortal sin (an act of drunkenness, for example) in a rector, bishop, magistrate, or sovereign, justified the people in disobeying and deposing these authorities, (*Walsingham, Hist. Ang.* p. 283;) 2dly, that no civil laws were to be obeyed, no taxes paid, unless the justice of such laws could be proved from Scripture, (*Walsing. ibid.*;) 3dly, that no man could lawfully swear in a court of justice, (*Walsing. page 204,*) or confirm his own or his friends' title to an estate forever, (*Knyght, Col. 2707*;) 4thly, that it was sinful in any clergyman to have one shilling's worth of property, (*Knyght, Col. 2648*;) 5thly, that his followers should despoil all that had property, (*Walsing, p. 284*;) 6thly, that God ought to obey the devil, (*Knyght, Col. 2648*;) 7thly, that colleges and universities were diabolical, (*Condem. Coun. Constan., Art. 29*;) 8thly, that it was unlawful to pray in churches, or keep the Lord's Day, (*Hypodig. Walsing. p. 557*;) 9thly, that temporal princes should cut off the head of any Ecclesiastic who sinned; and that, if the

prince himself sinned, the people should punish him, (Knyght, Col. 2657.)

Q. Did this dreadful doctrine produce its bitter fruit?

A. In four years from the time he opened his mission, he and his followers produced, amongst the people, insurrection, plunder, murder, and civil war. The Chancellor, Primate Ludbury, Lord Treasurer Hales, and Chief Justice Cavendish, were murdered by the Wyckliffite rioters, and their intention was to kill the king himself and all the nobility, (Walsing. Hist. Ang. p. 265.) They fixed advertisements to the church-doors in London, declaring that they had raised one hundred thousand men, to combat those who did not agree to their opinions, (Walsing. Hist. p. 385.)

Q. At least, John Huss and Jerom of Prague were put to death for heresy?

A. Yes; but they caused violent seditions in Bohemia; they excited a general insurrection—they deluged the country with blood. “The Hussites began by murdering the Mayor of Prague, then they overturned the government of the kingdom, after fighting several battles against their sovereign in the field, and after every where burning down monasteries, murdering the clergy, and even those who protected them.”—Aeneas. Sylv. ap Fleury.

Q. But were not Huss and Jerom put to death by the Ecclesiastical Council of Constance?

A. No; the Council excommunicated them, and declared it had no farther power regarding them, (Act. Counc. Sess. 15.) Nay, the Church, under her highest penalty, forbids any Ecclesiastic to concur in any sanguinary punishment; and hence, the bishops in the British Parliament leave the house, when trials of life and death are going on.

Q. But were not these men burnt at the instance of the Council?

A. No; they were committed to the flames by the magistrates, acting on the laws of the land, and by the order of the Elector Palatine, and of the Emperor Sigismond, (L'Enfant, l. iii. § 48.) Nor had the Council any thing to do with their death; its acts are still

extant ; and we have its history by L'Enfant, a Calvinist, who does not even hint at such solicitation on the part of the Council.

Q. Was not the Council culpable in permitting the execution of these men, after granting them a safe-conduct ?

A. The Council could not prevent the execution of seditious rebels ; John Huss had no safe-conduct, but merely a passport, promising him protection to and from the Council, (L'Enfant, Hist. Con. l. i. parag. 41.) The Council was guilty of no breach of faith to Jerom, but he was guilty of flagrant perjury to the Council ; he publicly anathematized his own doctrine, and yet afterwards confessed that, at the *time* he denounced it, he believed every tittle of it in his heart. See the Calvinist, L'Enfant, lib. iv, parag. 75.

Q. Are not the Protestants who were slaughtered on St. Bartholomew's day at Paris, an undeniable proof that the Catholic Church persecutes ?

A. Very far from it ; that massacre was caused by the unrelenting vengeance of Charles IX., and the bloody ambition of Catherine de Medicis. "On the day of this massacre an edict is published, in which the king declares, that whatever had happened was done by his express order, and *not out of hatred to Protestants*, but to put an end to the conspiracy of the Calvinist Coligny and his nefarious companions."

Q. What did the Calvinists do, which thus provoked the inexcusable vengeance of the king ?

A. They were reported to the king, as having hatched a plot to overturn his government and destroy himself. They certainly attempted to seize the king, and overturn the constitution of his dominions, (Maimb. lib. iv. Conspiracy of Amboise and Meaux ;) they threatened to whip the king, and to make a mechanic of him, (Ibid. ;) they fought four battles against him, and treasonably delivered Havre de Grace, the key of his dominions, to Queen Elizabeth, a foreign potentate ; they murdered multitudes of priests, religious, and unarmed people, burned churches and monasteries, and made rivers of blood flow in the very streets of Paris, (Davila.) In the city of Pamiers, they murdered all the clergy who

composed a procession on *Corpus Christi*. Heylen, Hist. Presb. Lib. ii.

Q. Did not the Bishops encourage the massacre of St. Bartholomew?

A. No; on the contrary, the Bishop of Lisieux opposed the execution of the king's order, saying: "It is the duty of the good shepherd to lay down his life for his sheep, not to let them be slaughtered before his face. These are my sheep, though they are gone astray, and I am resolved to run all hazards in protecting them." Maimb., Conten., Fleury, etc.

Q. Did not Pope Gregory XIII. rejoice when he heard of this massacre?

A. If he did, it was because the matter was represented to him, not in its true colors, but as a victory gained by the king in a fair manner, over impiety and sedition. Thuan. lib. i; Maimb. lib. iv. "The Pope considered Charles's act, as a necessary act of self-defense against the infamous, treasonable, and bloody plot of the Calvinists, Coligni, etc., against his life and government." Pagi. Brev. Gest. Rom. Pant. vol. vi. p. 729.

On Persecution.

THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. If it could be proved that the Reformed Churches have been as guilty of persecution as that of Rome, would this free it from terrible blame?

A. No; for they do not claim, *as it does*, to be the *infallible* and *only* Church of God. They admit that any or all of them may sometimes go wrong, and ought then candidly to confess and forsake this. But, on the other hand, if the Roman Church has ever acted with savage and devilish cruelty, then our Lord Jesus Christ has not always been with it in the sense of saving it from all error. Besides, that Church had *the actual power first*, and, at least, *began* the system of persecu-

tion: what Protestants did was *in return*. *Did the pure and perfect Church then, behave with such cruelty to MEN OF FALSE RELIGION, that it drove them to be cruel in return?*

Q. Is it easy to see why that Church should persecute?

A. Yes; two of its doctrines: 1st, that men ought not to judge for themselves about religion; and, 2d, that "it is of necessity to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff,"* tempt its earnest members to *force* other men into it for their very soul's salvation.

Q. Do all members of that Church believe in and defend persecution?

A. No; many of them will speak warmly and generously against it.

Q. Has their Church, however, declared for persecution?

A. Yes; it is a shameless untruth in any one who has examined the matter to say the contrary. It is only because there is no escape from this horrible disgrace by *argument*, that some of its defenders have ventured flatly to deny the facts.

Q. How can you prove this charge?

A. 1st, from the words of General Councils; 2d, from the words of Popes; 3d, from their *having always done it*, when they had the power; and, 4th, as it has been practised among them, defended by their chief writers, and even declared by Councils and Popes; so, if now renounced, it ought to have been condemned by Councils and Popes. *This has never been done.*

Q. Does any Reformed Church say that it is right to persecute men for their religious opinions?

A. *No, NONE.* *We challenge all men* to produce any proof of any such thing. On the contrary, there is scarcely a Protestant country where the Roman Church may not celebrate its public worship; while in most of the countries under their influence, no Protestant worship or meeting is permitted.

Q. What "General Councils" have taught, and even commanded persecution?

* Rom. Canon Law. Ex. Com. i. tit. 8. c. 1.

A. Among others, the 3d and 4th Lateran, and that of Constance. For instance: "We excommunicate and anathematize every heresy, etc., condemning all heretics by whatsoever names they may be denominated, etc. Let these persons when condemned be *abandoned to the secular authorities*, etc., that they may be *duly punished*, etc. Let the *secular authorities* of whatever offices, be advised and instructed, and if need be, *compelled by ecclesiastical censure*, etc., to take a public oath for the defense of the faith, that they will study to the utmost to *exterminate* from all territories subject to their jurisdiction *all heretics so marked by the Church*. And, if the secular power refuse to comply, let it be told to the Sovereign Pontiff, and let him denounce the subjects as released from their fealty and *give the country to the Catholics*, who, having EXTERMINATED THE HERETICS, may peaceably possess it."*

Q. But the Doctrinal Catechism says (or rather *insinuates*) that this Canon was not made by that Council?

A. The falsehood of this is betrayed by its saying right after, "*supposing the Canon TO BE GENUINE*," etc. I have quoted the Canon from an approved writer of the Roman Church, and it is in the Canon law, as printed *by authority* in 1839.

A. Is it true that "the sovereigns," etc., and not the clergy, made this Canon?

A. The writer of the Doctrinal Catechism knew well that none but the clergy had a vote in the Council.

Q. Is it true that this Canon was only made "for a particular class of heretics," etc., and this, to stop their "horrid brutalities," etc.?

A. Its very words show the contrary: it says, "*every heresy*," "*all heretics by whatsoever name they may be denominated*," etc. As for these Albigenses, etc., it is certain that many of them were very pious and virtuous; and for the rest, we can not tell *how far they have been slandered by their blood-thirsty persecutors*. As the Doctrinal Catechism quotes Mosheim about this, (and he is usually a very calm and fair historian,) let us see all that he says: "But the case of these men is involved in obscurity and perplexity. For they are ex-

* 4th Lat. Carranza, Sum. Conc. Gen. i. 297.

tolled for their piety by their very enemies, and at the same time crimes are attributed to them which are manifestly false." (II. 200.) "During the whole of this century the Roman Pontiffs were engaged in fierce and bloody conflicts with *heretics, that is, with such as taught differently from what the Roman Church prescribed to them, and brought under discussion the power and prerogatives of the Pontiffs.* For the sects of the Cathari, the Waldenses, and the Petrobrusians, spreading themselves over nearly all Europe, and especially in Italy, France, Germany, and Spain, collected congregations, and *threatened great danger to the Roman domination.* New sects were added to the old ones, differing indeed widely in their opinions, but *all agreeing in this, that the prevailing religion was false, and that the Roman Pontiffs most unjustly arrogated to themselves dominion over Christians and their religious worship.*" (344, 5.)

Q. What did the General Council of Constance do (A.D. 1414)?

A. It actually condemned two holy men, John Huss and Jerome of Prague, and had them BURNED TO DEATH for "HERESY,"* and this in violation of a solemn promise ("safe conduct,") made to Huss before, that he might come to the Council and go away from it safely.

Q. The Doctrinal Catechism *admits* that these men were put to death for *heresy*, but tries to make you think that it was also because they had caused bloodshed; how is this?

A. A worse falsehood could not well be told. Good reader, let me tell you *how* "they caused violent seditions," etc. Nothing of the kind happened until *after their dreadful murder by the Council.* Then their

* This *heresy* was chiefly their maintaining that the people ought to have the wine given them in the Holy Communion; which we have already seen to be the *true doctrine*. As for Wickliffe, during his life the monks had *tried* to have him punished for speaking against them and the Popes, and for translating the Bible into English. But he was protected by powerful friends and died in his bed. This same Council of Constance now condemned him and ordered his body to be dug up and thrown upon a dung-hill. The "doctrines" that "God ought to obey the devil," etc., are the *inventions of his enemies*. Who is *Dr. Fiddes*? Walsingham's History is all a piece of dull and credulous bigotry. Many of the authors cited by the Doctrinal Catechism are of *no value whatever*, while I quote only those of approved character.

friends arose in arms to avenge their death and to put down the tyrants.

Q. But the Doctrinal Catechism boldly declares that the Council is not chargeable with the death of the two martyrs; that it *only condemned* them; while, being composed of ecclesiastics, it could not "concur in any sanguinary punishment"?

A. Yes, it condemned them and then passed them over to the Emperor *to be burned*. It said to him in effect: "*We can not execute these heretics because we are clergymen; but you take them and BURN THEM TO DEATH.*" When Jerome, after the death of Huss, was brought before the Council, its members broke out in loud cries: "To the flames with him! to the flames!" And when he had been condemned, one of the bishops addressed him in behalf of the rest and said: "You have been detained in prison only from necessity: honorable witnesses alone have been listened to against you, and *the torture* has not been employed, *which was a great mistake*. *Would to God that you had been tortured!*"* The Council also afterwards decreed: "Whereas there are certain persons either ill-disposed or over-wise beyond what they ought to be, who, in secret and in public, traduce not only the Emperor but the sacred Council, saying or insinuating that the safe-conduct granted to John Huss, an arch-heretic of damnable memory, was basely violated contrary to all the rules of honor and justice; though the said John Huss by obstinately attacking the Catholic faith in the manner he did, rendered himself unworthy of any kind of safe-conduct and privilege, and though according to the natural, divine and human laws *no promise or faith ought to have been kept with him to the prejudice of the Catholic faith*. The sacred Synod hereby declares that the said Emperor did to the said John Huss, *notwithstanding his safe conduct*, what he *might* and OUGHT to have done."† So Peter Dens, an approved

* L'Enfant i. l. ii. p. 289, l. iv. p. 562—whom the Doctrinal Catechism itself quotes as good authority. Yet it is of such companies of men as this Council that we are to believe that "we are to look on their decisions as the decisions of the Holy Ghost!" (See p. 210.)

† Labbe xvi. 291, also L'Enfant. Yet the Doctrinal Catechism says, p. 338, "Nor had the Council any thing to do with their death; its acts

writer of the Roman Church, in his "Moral Theology," which is studied at Maynooth College, says: "Are *heretics rightly punished with DEATH?* St. Thomas (Aquinas) answers in the *affirmative*. . . . *The same is proved* by the condemnation, by the 14th Article, of JOHN HUSS, BY THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE."* Now both these General Councils, the 4th Lateran and that of Constance, were approved by the Popes, and are acknowledged in all the Roman Church. Can you then who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and mean to follow him as he is "meek and lowly of heart," say that that Church never has departed and never can from him? My dear brother, I entreat you not to excuse such horrid, savage, and sickening cruelty and treachery.

Q. How does it appear that the Popes have for the last seven hundred years favored persecution?

A. Because they have always approved these persecuting Councils, because they have frequently recommended persecution in their bulls, (as Leo X. in the Bull "Exsurge" *condemns* among other doctrines of *Luther*, this, "that it was against the will of the Holy Spirit to burn with fire men convicted of error,)"† and lastly, because they *established* and have *always favored* the *Inquisition*.‡

Q. Has the Roman Church ever expressed repentance of this dreadful doctrine and practice?

A. Never by either Pope or Council. No, that would be to admit that it had once erred, which it denies. On the contrary, in 1832 Gregory XVI. speaks of "that absurd and erroneous doctrine, or rather raving in favor and in defense of "LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE, for which MOST PESTILENTIAL ERROR," etc.

Q. What has always been the *practice* of the Roman Church?

A. Before the Reformation it persecuted all who de-

are still extant; and we have its history by L'Enfant, who does not even hint at such a solicitation on the part of the Council." How much of its pretended facts and quotations can you believe after that?

* II. 89.

† Bull. Rom. tom. iii. p. iii. 489.

‡ Fleury, xxiii. 478; Llorente, 218.

nied any of its doctrines ; for instance, in the province of Languedoc alone, *by the orders of Pope Innocent III.*, one hundred thousand persons were killed, many of them with shocking tortures and mutilations.* It attempted the same thing at the Reformation in every country of Europe, by which thousands of lives were lost in wars. In Spain and Italy it *put down* the Reformation with the frightful tortures of the Inquisition. In France it pursued the Protestants with cruel and treacherous wars, until it killed them almost all or drove them out of the country by millions. In the little country of the Dutch it beheaded, hanged, and burned fifty thousand in ten years, (all for heresy,†) and in England it burned to death four holy bishops and a great number of other persons.

Q. What was the Massacre of St. Bartholomew ?

One of the blackest things in all history. The King of France invited the chief Protestants of that country in a friendly way to Paris, and then at a signal given at midnight on St. Bartholomew's eve, (Aug. 24th, 1572,) they were all set upon and massacred in their beds : six thousand thus perished in Paris, and thirty thousand more in the rest of France.‡

Q. Did the Roman Church approve of this massacre ?

A. Yes. Its defenders have long writhed and struggled to get rid of the horrid infamy, but in vain. Because *one* bishop out of *fifty* opposed this, while all the rest of the Church joined in it, you are invited to believe that Church innocent ! When the news reached Rome, the Pope and Cardinals went in procession to the great French Church there to return thanks to God ! The Pope also sent his thanks to the King of France, and had medals made and distributed, on one side of which is a picture of an angel with a cross in one hand and a sword in the other, and dead bodies lying around, with the inscription : "Slaughter of the Huguenots."§ One

* Mosheim Cont. xii. p. ii. c. iii.

† The denial of this by the Doctrinal Catechism, when the author must know better, is a dreadful falsehood.

‡ Ranke (ii. 69) says fifty thousand in all.

§ Mezeray, v. 162. Appendix to Fath. Paul, ii. 777.

Cardinal (who had presided at the Council of Trent) gave a thousand pieces of gold to the messengers who brought the news, and one of the Popes (Clement VII.) afterwards spoke of this as "the celebrated day of St. Bartholomew, *most cheering to Catholics.*"*

Q. What has been the practice of the Roman Church since then ?

A. Even down to this day, though it is greatly weakened and has not *power* to be as fierce as before, it forbids any other religion, and severely punishes those who quit its false doctrines, in those countries where it has the power. In Spain, Portugal, Tuscany, Naples, and *especially in the dominions of the Pope*, no Protestant worship is permitted. Should any of the people of those countries become Protestants, they must keep it secret, or else suffer imprisonment or even death. *In Protestant countries, however*, the Roman Church now professes to abhor persecution.†

Q. What have some of their chief writers said ?

A. (St.) Thomas, (Aquinas,) "Heretics may not only be excommunicated but *justly killed.*"‡ Card. Bellarmine : "There are three causes on account of which reason teaches that heretics are to be put to death : first, lest the evil should injure the good ; second, that by the punishment of a few many may be reformed ; for threatened punishments rouse many whom impunity was making torpid, *and this result we daily see where the Inquisition flourishes.* Lastly, *it is a benefit to obstinate heretics* to remove them from this life ; for the longer they live the more errors they invent," etc.§

* Ranke ii. 235.

† Except when some one more zealous than cunning speaks out plainly ; as the *Rambler*, a journal of that Church, published in England in 1850 thus : "We are children of a Church which has ever avowed the deepest hostility to the principles of religious liberty, and which has never given the shadow of a sanction to the theory that civil liberty as such is necessarily a blessing to all. How intolerable it is to see this miserable device for deceiving the Protestant world still so widely popular among us !"

‡ II. 11.

§ II. 555, De Laici's. Also Peter Dens, as quoted before on p. 395, Alphonso De Castro, etc. It is curious that some apologists for the Roman Church say much of a sermon preached by him in England (for some cunning political purpose) *against persecution*, though he afterwards wrote his atrocious book *in favor of persecution* !

Q. In what words of the oath which *every bishop* of that Church takes, does he vow to persecute heretics?

A. "Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said Lord, (the Pope,) and his aforesaid successors, I will to my utmost power persecute and make war upon."*

Q. In what other instance has it commended the persecuting men to death for their religion?

A. In the most plain and solemn manner in its prayer book, by which, on every 30th of May, in Spain, the example of (St.) Ferdinand is commended to the people by the Church in its public worship, for his persecuting heretics, "for whose execution when condemned to be burnt he used to carry the wood with his own hands." (Brev. Prop. S.S. Hispan. 30 Maii.)

Q. Have the Reformed Churches also been guilty of this dreadful departure from the Law of our Lord Jesus Christ?

A. *We can* say that was not *our Church*, but individuals who sometimes retorted upon the Roman Church its savage violence. There is no doctrine or canon, no decree or resolution of a Convocation or Convention of our Church in favor of this. No oath of persecution is ever taken. *No procession of our Church in honor of a massacre can be named.* Yet we might allow all the persecution that has been done by Protestants to be charged to their churches, and yet challenge the comparison.† They were the injured party at first, and were tempted to revenge. Still they *never any thing like repaid* the cruelties which they had suffered. For instance, the deaths which they are charged with causing in France, were almost all *in battle*, in which they were *defending* themselves. As for *executions for heresy*, not a dozen such can be found in all, against *one hundred thousand* on the other side. So in England, Queen Mary had four bishops of the Reformed Church, (besides many other clergyman,) famous, old, and saintly men, tried and condemned for *heresy*; and then before vast crowds tied to stakes and *burned to death*, which they bore with the heavenly courage of

* Pontif. Rom. i. 178.

† This would be true, admitting the pretended facts of the Doctrinal Catechism about Protestant persecutions. But these are great exaggerations, as every fair reader of history knows.

the first martyrs. Only two or three years after this, the Protestants came into power again, and, although they were smarting under this dreadful provocation, of the Roman bishops not a hair of the head of one of them was touched, though some of them had been the bloodiest persecutors! Afterwards, indeed, the Roman Church made conspiracies against *the government of the country*, and then severe laws were made against that Church. And then some of its priests and other members being tried by a court and jury in the regular way for *treason* and the like, (sometimes for plots to assassinate the queen,* never for *heresy*,) were convicted and executed, (never *burned*.) Like this were the "Protestant persecutions" generally in other countries.

Q. Do you mean by this, that Protestants have always shown a kind and patient spirit toward their enemies?

A. By no means. They have sometimes gone far astray from the gentle spirit of our Lord and Saviour, to revenge and violence; but certainly, *never any thing like as much* as those who claim to be *the only Christians*! There has never been such a thing as a Protestant INQUISITION, or ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S. The more they have prevailed, the milder and more generous they have become. At this day those Protestant nations which are the most zealous to carry pure religion through the world, are the most tolerant and liberal on the globe.



On the Inquisition.

DOCTRINAL CATECHISM.

Q. Is not the Inquisition a state engine employed by the Catholic Church for the purpose of persecution?

A. No; the Church has not, and never had, any connection with the Inquisition, farther than this, that

* It is now beyond doubt that Pope Pius V. was at the bottom of some of these plots. (See Mignet's Hist. of Mary Stuart, ii. 159.)

some of her members, through mistaken zeal, resorted to this cruel and unwarrantable means for the purpose of suppressing immoral, blasphemous, and infidel doctrines.

Q. Why do you say that the Inquisition is no part of the Catholic religion?

A. Because no such court existed till the twelfth century; and in many Catholic countries no such tribunal has ever existed; whilst, in some of those where it was established, it has been long since suppressed.

Q. Was not St. Dominic the founder of the Inquisition?

A. This is a Protestant calumny; it was no where established till after his death. Mosheim, Saec. xiii.

Q. If some Popes and Bishops and Catholic Princes established and used this dreadful engine, it must certainly be a part of the Catholic religion?

A. No more than Queen Elizabeth's Court of High Commission, which the Dissenters of that period declared to be more intolerable than the Inquisition itself, was a necessary part of Protestantism. (See Hume Hist. Eng. James ii. c. vi; Mosheim, vol. iv. p. 395.)

Q. Was not the Inquisition, with Ecclesiastics at its head, competent to pass sentence of the loss of limbs or of death?

A. No; it had no such power. Very few received sentence of death at all from the Roman Inquisition; there is not one such sentence recorded; and more blood was shed by the Calvinistic Huguenots of France on account of religion, than could have been shed by five hundred Spanish Inquisitions.

Q. Why such an engine at all?

A. The rulers at that time were, in their wisdom, impressed with the idea, that it was the best mode of suppressing sacrilege, profanation, apostasy, magic, and other crimes, which are corporally punished in every country, whether Catholic or Protestant. How many *witches* did the Calvinist ministers burn in Scotland, or the early Puritans in New-England? How many Papists did they persecute and prosecute? (Arnot's Hist. of Edinburgh.)

Q. The Inquisition, then, is no essential part of the Catholic religion?

A. It is so far from being so, that most Catholics condemn it as loudly and as earnestly as Protestants themselves. It is a mere state engine, which certain rulers used as a matter of policy, not so much to put down heresy, as to check the seditions and immoralities that in every age were the consequences of heresy, an engine which Catholics in general denounce as opposed equally to policy, justice, and charity.

Q. Have Protestants any right to be perpetually harping on the Inquisition?

A. As a matter of principle, they should come to the charge with clean hands; living, as they do, in glass houses, they should not throw stones. What difference is there between the jails, into which they cast thousands of Catholics, and the prison of the Inquisition; and what difference between the deaths the unhappy victims on both sides died? If Queen Mary put to death two hundred and seventy-seven Protestants for their rebellious opposition, Protestants have had ample revenge, through the first Protestant king, Henry VIII. who slaughtered sixty Catholics for denying his spiritual supremacy; and through their merciless Elizabeth, who persecuted, in most instances, to death, and in all to utter ruin, twelve hundred Catholics, for their faith; and if Mary burnt her victims, Elizabeth hanged, quartered, embowelled, and burnt hers. See, for other examples of persecution, Lingard, vol. viii. reign of Elizabeth; and for the penal laws against Catholics, vol. viii. p. 143. In fact, Catholics have experienced from the Protestants of these countries only one continued persecution more or less intense. They have been *permitted* to fight for the honor of a country and the security of a crown, which, in return, gave them no encouragement, and, till very lately, scarcely any protection.

On the Inquisition.

THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What is the Inquisition ?

A. A secret court *established by the Popes, and recommended by them to be set up in all countries.* Its business is to inquire out and punish those who are suspected of not believing as the Roman Church does. All persons, even parents and children, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters, are commanded to assist in this, by secretly denouncing to the "Inquisitors," those dearest to them whom they suspect of being "heretics." The suspected person is dragged from his bed at night and taken to a dungeon. He is kept from seeing any friend, and is at times brought before the *Inquisitors* and questioned. He is never allowed to see the witnesses against him or to know their names. If he does not at once confess what he is charged with, he is horribly tortured until he does confess, and say that he repents. But if he persists that he is innocent, or refuses to give up his honest belief, he is put to death, *usually by burning.**

Q. What Popes founded the Inquisition ?

A. Innocent III. and Gregory IV.

Q. What Popes afterwards favored it and urged the various nations to establish it among them ?

A. We may say *all of them*, especially Sixtus IV.

Q. What Council or Pope of that Church has ever *condemned* the Inquisition ?

A. *None whatever.*

Q. Who were the "some members of the Church," and the "*certain rulers*" who (according to the Doctrinal Catechism) used this "cruel and unwarrantable means" of serving our Lord with this "mere state engine" of the Inquisition ?

A. Chiefly *the Popes themselves*, "to refuse submission to whom is a grievous sin"! (See p. 203.)

* See Limborch, Llorente, Geddes, etc.

Q. Where does the Inquisition exist to this day ?

A. AT ROME. Yes, though the common-sense of the civilized world in the light of the Reformation has so cried shame upon this abomination that it has been suppressed in all other countries, it still exists under the government of the Popes.*

Q. What then, must we call the assertion of the Doctrinal Catechism that the Roman Church is not guilty in the matter of the Inquisition ?

A. A horrid falsehood, like many other things already shown.

Q. *Did* not the Inquisition pass sentence of death upon "heretics" ?

A. Yes ; and its cruelty seems even more shocking from the disgusting hypocrisy with which it pretended not to desire the blood of its victim. When the Inquisitors failed to make some one "recant," who, though they had almost torn him to pieces with tortures, still held firmly the pure gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ ; then they would condemn him as an "*obstinate heretic*." On some *Sunday* soon afterward, he was dressed in a garment painted over with devils and flames, and taken *by the inquisitors* in procession to some public square where stakes were *already set up*, and wood piled around them ready to blaze, and a vast crowd assembled to see the sight. The martyr was then delivered to the civil officers by the inquisitors, with a request "*not to touch his blood or put his life in any sort of danger*" ! He was then at once tied to a stake, and burned to death, the priests standing by and looking on with pleasure !† One of the Popes ordered the Inquisition of Spain at once, to commit to the flames all their prisoners, and that Inquisition (Feb. 16th 1568) *condemned all the inhabitants of the Netherlands to death for heresy, only excepting a few persons by name*. King Philip II. confirmed this sentence by a proclamation, and ordered it to be carried into im-

* As was seen in the proclamation of Inquisitor-General Airaldi in 1857.

† Limborch iv. c. 40, etc.

mediate execution *without regard to sex, age, or condition!**

Q. Is it "a Protestant calumny" that (St.) Dominic was the founder of the Inquisition? *Does Mosheim prove this?*

A. Here is just what that writer says. After mentioning that Pope Innocent III. sent two priests to the country of Languedoc to search and destroy "heretics," he says:† "To these were afterwards added others, the most noted of whom was Dominic, a Spaniard, the well-known founder of the order of preaching monks. These men acting *by AUTHORITY from the Pontiff*, and without consulting the bishops or asking their aid, hunted after heretics; and such of them as they could not convert by arguments, they caused to be subjected to *capital punishments*. In the language of common parlance, they were called *inquisitors*, and from them that terrible tribunal for heretics called *the Inquisition*, took its rise." "But Gregory IX. altered the institution in the year 1233, and conferred on the preaching monks, or Dominicans, the inquisition for heresy in France." "From this period we are to date the commencement of the dreadful tribunal of the Inquisition," etc. *The Popes*, indeed, strictly speaking, and not Dominic, established the Inquisition as it has been known ever since; but this "saint" had already led the way to it as a bloody inquisitor and persecutor.

Q. Have the Reformed Churches ever sanctioned or favored any thing as cruel and dreadful as this?

A. Never. The "High Commission Court" in England (which *was* a political affair, and *has not existed for more than two hundred years*) was never soberly compared to it.‡ And now nothing of the kind whatever exists in any Protestant country. All the severe laws which they once had in England, (though mainly meant to guard against the rebellious intrigues of the Jesuits, and very seldom strictly enforced,) against the worship of the Roman Church, have been *long since* repealed.

* Motley, Hist. Dutch Rep. i. 221.

† Cent. xiii. p. 2, c. 5.

‡ It never had or used the power of punishing with death.

Q. How many persons are computed by sober writers to have perished in these persecutions by the Roman Church?

A. No less than FIFTY MILLIONS ; while the most extravagant estimate of the deaths caused by Protestants in their wars of defense and every other way, would not rise to *a hundredth part* of this.

Q. Is this bloody persecutor that Church which claims to be *the whole and only Church* of God, out of which none can be saved?

A. Yes, this is it !

Q. Do not many members of that Church speak with horror of these cruelties?

A. Yes, many ; and the more is the pity and the wonder they remain in such a Church.

Q. What then would you say to them about this?

A. I would say : "REMEMBER ; our Lord says, Beware of false teachers ; ye shall know them by their *fruits*." O my fellow-Christians ! if you are now in the Roman Church because you think there can be only *one true Church*, do you not see that you have in some way, made a dreadful mistake in choosing of all, that Church which is most cruel and murderous ?



On the Power of a General Council, or Papal Consistory, in Temporal Matters.

DOCTRINAL CATECHISM.

Q. Can a General Council frame new matters, or articles of faith ?

A. No ; a General Council can only explain what has been *already* revealed ; it belongs to God alone to reveal new articles of faith.

Q. What if a General Council, or Papal Consistory, should undertake to depose a king, or absolve his subjects from their obedience ?

A. No Catholic is bound to submit to such a decree. Indeed, every Catholic may renounce, upon oath, any such doctrine, and this without the least breach of Catholic principle.

Q. Must not Catholics believe the Pope in himself to be infallible?

A. This is a Protestant invention; it is no article of the Catholic faith; no decision of his can oblige, under pain of heresy, unless it be received and enforced by the teaching body, that is, by the Bishops of the Church.

Q. Can the Pope absolve subjects from their allegiance on account of the heresy or schism of their king?

A. No; such dispensation or absolution is null; Catholics are still at liberty to defend their king and country at the hazard of their lives, even against the Pope himself.

Q. Can Catholics lawfully kill their prince or king if he be excommunicated for heresy or schism?

A. Such an act is declared, by the Catholic General Council of Constance, damnable and heretical, as well as contrary to the known laws of God and nature.

Q. Can the Pope, or any power in the Church, license men to lie, or forswear themselves—to injure their neighbors, or destroy their country—under pretense of promoting the Catholic cause?

A. Such license can have no other effect than to add sacrilege and blasphemy to the commission of the above crimes.

Q. Are equivocation or mental reservation, allowed by the Catholic Church?

A. No; these are Protestant charges, invented for the purpose of exhibiting Catholics in odious colors. The Catholic Church never taught such unworthy doctrines; on the contrary, she disapproves and condemns them.

On the Power of a General Council, or Papal Consistory, in Temporal Matters.

THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. *Is it* a "Protestant invention," that it is taught in the Roman Church that the Pope is of himself *infallible*?

A. This is certainly the doctrine of the Jesuits and of many others. I quote from two writers of great

authority in that Church: "*We can believe nothing if we do not believe with a divine faith that the Pope is the successor of St. Peter, and INFALLIBLE.*"* "*But if the Pope should err by enjoining vices or prohibiting virtues, the Church unless she wished to sin against conscience, would be bound to BELIEVE THE VICES TO BE GOOD AND THE VIRTUES BAD.*"†

Q. Do the Popes claim supreme political as well as spiritual power in the world?

A. Yes; the Roman Canon Law says: "All the faithful of Christ are of necessity of salvation under the Roman Pontiff, *who has both swords*, and judges all men, *but is judged by none*. We are instructed by the Gospel that in the power of the Pope there are *two swords*, the *spiritual* AND THE TEMPORAL: the one to be used *for* the Church, the other *by* it: the one by the priest, the other by the hands of kings and soldiers, but AT THE NOD AND SUFFERANCE OF THE PRIEST."‡

Q. Have they ever actually claimed to change the government of any country?

A. Yes, *many times*; as when Gregory VII. deposed the Emperor of Germany, and when Pius V. as "*Prince over all people and all kingdoms*," affected to change the government of England, A PROTESTANT COUNTRY, in 1570, by deposing Queen Elizabeth. The chief writer of that Church in this country says: "The power the Church exercised over sovereigns in the Middle Ages was not a usurpation, was not derived from the concession of princes, *or the consent of the people*, but was and is hers BY DIVINE RIGHT, and *whoso resists it rebels against the King of kings and Lord of Lords*."

* Lew. Capsensis De Fid. Disp. ii. 6. Quoted by Jewell.

† Bellarmine De Pont. iv. 5. He also quotes Albertus Pighius without objection in favor of the absolute infallibility of the Pope. This is indeed the only consistent doctrine of that Church. For otherwise, suppose the Pope to excommunicate some man for heresy, (as was done to Luther,) and him to deny the charge and say that it was the Pope who was wrong; who is to decide between them? Must they wait for a General Council? And does the excommunication hold in the mean time or not? And suppose the General Council decides against the Pope, but he still claims to be right? How can we then have the voice of the Church by a "General Council approved by the Pope"?

‡ II. Ex. Com. i. 8.

This is the ground on which we defend the power exercised over sovereigns [and *nations*] by Popes and Councils in the Middle Ages.”*

Q. Have the Popes ever withdrawn their claim to this power?

A. No. As the same writer says: “What the Church *has done*, what she has expressly or tacitly approved in the past, that is exactly what she will do, expressly or tacitly approve in the future, *if the same circumstances occur*,” (that is, we may suppose, if it ever has the power again.)†

Q. Is not “equivocation or mental reservation allowed” by the Roman Church?

A. My dear reader, you may be one of those members of that Church, (as I believe there are many,) who abhor all deceit. It will therefore give you pain to have this proved to you. Yet listen with a fair mind. See indeed how full this Doctrinal Catechism is of falsehoods and unfair arguments; yet perhaps the writer of it thought he was doing God and the Church service. (St.) Alphonsus Liguori says: “It is a certain and a common opinion among all divines that it is lawful for a just cause to *use equivocation* in the ways proposed, and to *confirm it with an oath*.”‡ As an instance, a servant may say to one who inquires for his master, “He is not here,” meaning, “*not in this door*,” etc., and even that he is *out of doors* when he is *in bed*. So a priest may *deny under oath* what has been communicated to him in confession.§ The Canon Law even says, “An oath contrary to the utility of the Church is not to be observed.”||

Q. In what public and flagrant instance has the Roman Church acted upon this atrocious notion, and even declared it as a doctrine?

A. In the treacherous murder of John Huss by the Council of Constance, (see p. 393,) after which, they made this decree: “The present Synod declares that

* Brownson’s Review, (approved by twenty-eight bishops of the United States,) Jan. 1853, p. 48.

† Ibid. Jan. 1854, p. 10.

‡ Moral Theol. iii. 151.

§ Ib. 153–163.

|| Pithou. Sept. Dec. t. 10.

every *safe-conduct* granted by the Emperor, kings, and other temporal princes, to heretics or persons accused of heresy in hopes of reclaiming them, *ought not to be of any prejudice to the Catholic faith or to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction*, nor to hinder but such persons *may and ought to be* examined, judged, and *punished*, according as justice shall require, if those heretics shall refuse to revoke their errors, *even though they should be arrived at the place where they are to be judged* ONLY UPON THE FAITH OF THE SAFE-CONDUCT WITHOUT WHICH THEY WOULD NOT HAVE COME THITHER. And the person who shall have promised them security SHALL NOT IN THIS CASE BE OBLIGED TO KEEP HIS PROMISE, BY WHATSOEVER TIE HE MAY BE ENGAGED.”*

Q. It seems then hardly possible to escape from the belief that not only the infallibility of the Pope, but also this falsehood and treachery, are doctrines and duties in the Roman Church. Yet, if we can put any faith in the denials of the Doctrinal Catechism, what is *the least* we can say?

A. That these writers so contradict one another (whether honestly or not) about these doctrines of their Church, that, so far from its being true that “all Catholics (Romanists) believe the same truths, and to reject any one of these truths is to cut one’s self off from the Catholic (Roman) communion,” (see p. 63,) we can not be sure what its real doctrines are.



On the Reading of the Scriptures.

DOCTRINAL CATECHISM.

Q. Do Catholics forbid the reading of the Sacred Scripture?

A. No; they only forbid the abuse of that thrice Holy Volume, which the Catholic Church has ever preserved and regarded as one of her most sacred deposits, and without whose preservation the Protestant Church would never have had it.

* Labb. xvi. 301.

Q. Is it forbidden to any one ?

A. Yes, to those who would *certainly abuse it*, to those ignorantly proud people, of whom St. Peter speaks, where he says, (2 Pet. 1 : 20,) that certain parts of St. Paul's Epistles "*are HARD to be understood, which the UNLEARNED and UNSTABLE wrest, as also the rest of the Scriptures, to THEIR OWN PERDITION.*"

Q. Why are not all permitted to interpret the Scripture as they will ?

A. Because (2 Pet. 3 : 16) God has given only "*SOME to be apostles, some prophets, other some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers.*" Because its sense is to be sought from those who were sent to teach ; from the "*tips of the Priest who shall keep knowledge, and from whose mouth they shall require the law.*" (Mal. 2 : 7.)

Q. Do not Catholic Bishops and Popes discourage the reading of the Scriptures ?

A. No ; the Catholic clergy are bound to read the Scripture for nearly an hour every day ; the Catholic Bishops of Great Britain publicly declared, in 1826, that the circulation of authentic copies of Scripture was never discouraged by the Church ; Pope Pius VII., in a rescript, April 18, 1820, addressed to the English Bishops, tells them "*to encourage their people to read the Holy Scriptures, because nothing can be more useful, more consoling, more animating.* They serve to confirm the faith, to support the hope, and to inflame the charity of the true Christian."

Q. Does not the Catholic Church forbid versions of the Scripture into modern tongues, for the very purpose of keeping the Scripture from the people.

A. Even the Rev. Robert Adams refutes this Protestant slander ; though a Protestant himself, he declares that the Catholic laity are not debarred the use of the Scriptures. (*Religious World Displayed*, vol. ii. p. 78.) But the best refutation of this calumny is, that Pope Pius VI., writing to Martini, Archb. of Florence, on the subject of his translation of the Scriptures, applauds his zeal in publishing his version, and exhorts the faithful to read it. This document is dated April,

1788, and is prefixed to every English edition of the Catholic Bible.

Q. Is it not said that Catholics published few versions of Scripture till they were compelled to do so by Protestant example?

A. This is another Protestant slander propagated to catch the ignorant. Before Protestantism had a being, there were upwards of twenty versions of the Scripture into almost all the modern languages, as will be evident from the subjoined detail.

EARLY CATHOLIC VERSIONS.

Fust's, printed at Mentz,.....	Anno 1462
Bender's, printed at Augsburg,.....	1467
Malermi's Italian Bible,.....	1471
Four Gospels, Belgic,.....	1472
Entire Bible, Belgic, Cologne,.....	1475
Julian's, (an Augustinian monk,).....	1477
Delft Edition,.....	1477
St. Vincent Ferrier's, Spanish,.....	1478
Gouda Edition,.....	1479
Guyards des Moulins, French,.....	1490
Four Versions mentioned by Beausobre, (Hist. de la Reformation, livre iv.) printed before.....	1522
Estable's New Testament,.....	1523
" Old Testament printed before.....	1528
Bruccioli's Italian Bible,.....	1532
Antwerp and Louvain,.....	1573

EARLY PROTESTANT VERSIONS.

Luther's Version of New Testament,.....	Anno 1522
Tyndale's New Testament,.....	1526
First Belgic Version,.....	1527
Luther's Old Testament,.....	1530
Tyndale's Pentateuch,.....	1530
Miles Coverdale's Version,.....	1535
Olivetan's Old Testament,.....	1537
First Italian Version,.....	1562

ENGLISH CATHOLIC VERSIONS.

Version of whole Bible, MS.,.....	Anno 1290
Anglo-Saxon Version, MS., about.....	1300

FRENCH, GERMAN, SPANISH, AND ITALIAN MS. VERSIONS.

German, about 800; Italian, 1270; Spanish, 1280; French, 1294.*

* Six versions, and twelve editions, of the Sacred Volume appeared in German before Luther's time. The same is true of three versions, and many editions, in Italian. Four versions, with a multitude of edi-

On the Reading of the Scriptures.

THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What was the belief of the first Christians about the use of the Holy Scriptures?

A. That *every one*, young or old, rich or poor, learned or unlearned, ought to read them diligently. As (St.) Chrysostom says: "Let us therefore not delay to purchase Bibles, lest we receive a vital wound. The grace of the Spirit provided that tax-gatherers, fishermen, makers of tents, and shepherds, ignorant and unlettered men, should write these books, in order that *no one however simple* might be able to run to this excuse, of *not understanding* the Scriptures; and so that the laborer and the servant, and the widow and the most unlearned of all, from hearing them read, might carry away some gain and good."* So spoke all the other Fathers.†

Q. Is this the doctrine of the Roman Church?

A. You shall see for yourself. Here is the 4th Rule in regard to *prohibited books*, made by the *Council of Trent*, and published in a Bull of Pope Pius IV., March 24th, 1564: "*Inasmuch as it is manifest from experience that if the Holy Bible, translated into the people's language, be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause* MORE EVIL THAN GOOD to

tions, were published in Gothic and French. Two Belgic versions, with several editions: The Bohemian version was published, Prague, 1488; at Putna, 1498; at Venice, 1506, and 1511. For other Catholic translations, in almost all the languages of the world, and many of them published in Rome, the very HOTBED OF POPERY, see Le Long's *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Bochmer, Leipsic, 1709; and note appended to Lord Shrewsbury's Letter to Lord Bealey, page 90.

* Concio. in Lazar. iii. It was then thought (and should be now) the duty of every Christian *to be able to read* THE Book; or if, unfortunately, this was out of his power, to seize every proper occasion of *hearing it read*, whether in church or in private.

† *Fleury* admits that the decree of the Council of Thoulouse, in 1229, forbidding the laity to have the Scriptures, or that they should be translated at all into the language of the people, was the *the first instance of this ever known*. (Ecc. Hist. xvi. 676.)

arise from it, it is on this point referred to the judgments of the *bishops or INQUISITORS*, who may *by the advice of the priest or confessor* PERMIT the reading of the Bible, translated into the people's language by *Catholic* authors, to those persons whose faith and piety *they* apprehend will be *augmented* and not *injured* by it; AND THIS PERMISSION THEY MUST HAVE IN WRITING. But if any one shall have the PRESUMPTION *to read or possess it*, WITHOUT SUCH WRITTEN PERMISSION, he shall *not receive absolution* until he shall have first DELIVERED UP SUCH BIBLE *to the ordinary*. BOOKSELLERS, too, who shall *sell or otherwise dispose of Bibles* in the people's language to *any person not having such permission*, shall *forfeit the value of the books*, to be applied by the bishop to some pious use, and shall be subjected by him to such other penalties as he shall judge proper according to the nature of the offense."* And so Pope Gregory XVI. in his Bull of May 8th, 1844, says: "WE CONFIRM AND RENEW *the decrees recited above* delivered in former times by Apostolic authority, against the publication, distribution, reading, and possession of books of the Holy Scriptures translated into the people's language."†

Q. Is this merely because they (of the Roman Church) think Protestants have translated the Scripture falsely?

A. No; for even when *they* have translated it to suit themselves, and added *notes* to explain away what seems plainly against them, they will not even then allow any one to read it without a *special written permission* from his bishop.

Q. Have not some of the Popes approved or *seemed to approve* of the people's reading the Scriptures?

A. Yes; the Doctrinal Catechism says so. But what then are we to believe, what *can* we believe is the real doctrine of the Roman Church? There is here either *wicked double-dealing*, or *great uncertainty and change*. This is *certain*, that the plain language of the Scriptures is so much against the Roman doctrines,

* Bull. Rom. iv. Pt. ii. p. 174. † Ib.

that if you, reader, belong to that Church, probably your priest does not like to have you read them: (*have you that necessary written permission of your Bishop?*) In the countries where that Church has all its own way, there is scarcely any, I may even say *no*, reading them by the people.

Q. What late and well-known fact in this country proves this?

A. That three or four years ago a wealthy citizen of New-York, (Mr. A. G. Phelps,) offered to have printed and distributed in Italy at his own expense, fifty thousand copies of the Scriptures of *whatever translation Archbishop Hughes* (of the Roman Church) *should approve*. NO ANSWER WAS EVER RETURNED TO THIS OFFER. It is difficult even in *Rome* ("*the most holy city*") to find an Italian Bible for sale; and when you do find it, it is in *twenty-three volumes*, and *costs as much as a poor man's wages for six months*. This is the 'translation by Martini' which the Doctrinal Catechism (as "*the best refutation of the Protestant calumny*") tells us Pope Pius VI. applauds the translator for, and "EXHORTS THE FAITHFUL TO READ"!

Q. What do you say of the list of "Early Catholic versions," etc., which the Doctrinal Catechism brings forward to overwhelm "Protestant slanders"?

A. First, It is full of absurd mistakes. For instance, "Guyard des Moulins, (French,)" did not translate *the Bible* at all, but only a sort of "Sacred History, written by a monk in the Dark Ages;"* and Estaple was one of the French *Reformers*! Secondly, Almost all of these appeared just before or about the time of *the Reformation*, and *led the way to it*, and *helped it forward*. Thirdly, It is not certain that *any* of them were favored by the rulers of the Roman Church.† Fourthly, It is certain that when these rulers were alarmed by the Reformation, they opposed the general reading of the Scriptures. Hallam says: "The first list of books *pro-*

* Townley's Illustrations, i. 392.

† One of the chief complaints against Wickliffe in England was, not that he made an incorrect translation of the Scriptures into English, but that he translated them at all. (See Knighton, de Event., as cited in Milner's Ch. Hist. ii. 140.)

hibited by the Church was set forth by Paul IV., in 1559, (just after the Reformation.) His Index includes all BIBLES IN MODERN LANGUAGES, enumerating forty-eight editions, CHIEFLY PRINTED IN COUNTRIES STILL WITHIN THE OBEDIENCE OF THE (ROMAN) CHURCH.* Fifthly, these editions were all small, not furnishing twenty thousand copies in all in seven hundred years, and then at the price of hundreds of dollars for a single Bible; while Protestants have in the last fifty years published more than *fifty millions* of copies, (without note or comment, letting the word of God speak for itself,) at a low price which any poor man could pay, and even *giving away* millions of them. Sixthly, When the Roman Church has published translations of the Bible, it has *changed the words of God* to make them agree with its doctrines. For, to say nothing of all its known Bibles, (in regard to which I hold myself ready to *prove* this,) in 1686 the Archbishop of Bordeaux, published a French New Testament with a number of such passages as this, (1 Tim. 4 : 1,) "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the *Roman* faith," instead of "*from the faith*," there being no word for *Roman* in the original! This profane and impudent cheat was received with such disgust by the learned world, that those who published it, secretly bought up and destroyed all the copies they could. But fortunately, at least four or five are preserved in the great English libraries at Oxford and elsewhere. Can they who are guilty of such things use St. Paul's words and say that they "have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, *nor handling the word of God deceitfully*" ?

* Hallam's Mod. Lit. i. 413.

On Monks, Friars, and Nuns.

DOCTRINAL CATECHISM.

Q. What is the meaning of religious Orders ?

A. The very fact that we have in revelation counsels, as well as commands, proves that such Orders should exist in the Church as should observe these counsels, for Christ did not give them in vain.

Q. What do you mean by councils ?

A. Those virtues which Christ has recommended, but not commanded under pain of sin, such as chastity, voluntary poverty, etc.

Q. Is there not something wrong in becoming a Monk or a Nun ?

A. No ; but if we are to believe the Scripture, there is something peculiarly praiseworthy in doing so. Christ speaks often of the danger of riches ; he tells the young man in the Gospel to go and sell all that he had, and give it to the poor, if he wished to *be perfect*. Now, this is what Monks and Nuns do ; and can there be any thing wrong in following the advice of Christ himself, in embracing a life of voluntary poverty, instead of exposing one's self to the seductive danger of riches ? St. Paul declares, that he who giveth his virgin in marriage doth well, but *he that giveth her not, doth better* ; and can there be any thing wrong in following this advice of the Apostle, in vowing and preserving that brightest of all virtues—chastity ? Christ declares, that we must deny ourselves, take up our cross, and follow him ; can there then be any thing wrong in those, who, finding that they can not do this well in the midst of this world's temptations, retire from it into the cloister, and there practise the counsels of Christ, in obedience to, and under the guidance of, the great masters of a religious life, always to be found in every religious establishment ?

Q. Are all religious employed merely in laboring for their own, or praying for the salvation of others ?

A. No ; many religious Orders are established entirely for the good of their neighbors, some to teach the ignorant, others to preach the Gospel, some to provide for the poor, others to imbue the minds of the rich youth with knowledge and virtue, some to attend the sick, especially in the public hospitals, and others to redeem the slave and the captive.

Q. May there not be abuses in these establishments ?

A. There is nothing so good that it may not be abused ; marriage, every profession, the very word of God, nay, our common Christianity are all occasionally abused ; but surely no good Christian will think this an argument either against them, or to get rid of them.

On Monks, Friars, and Nuns.

THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Are orders of Monks, Friars, and Nuns, recommended in the Book of God ?

A. There is nothing about them there.

Q. Did they exist among the first Christians ?

A. There is nothing about them in the Christian writings of the first one hundred and fifty years after the Apostles. After this, some men did begin to live alone in the deserts as *hermits*, but there were no *orders* of monks for a hundred years later, though the like did exist among the heathen, (as it does to this day among the Pagans of India and China,) from whom it was unhappily imitated among Christians.

Q. Since, then, the Church did long exist in its first and pure days without these orders, there is no absolute need of them ; but has experience shown that they are useful ?

A. No. They flourished most in the Dark Ages, those times of greatest ignorance, coarseness, and violence. They have themselves been the patrons of the

most ridiculous and unmanly superstitions,* and very often of shameful vice. To this day the people of any country are poor, ignorant, oppressed, and vicious, in proportion as monks and nuns abound among them. For instance, the Kingdom of Naples has more of them than any other country, and it has by all consent the worst governed and most ignorant and wicked population in the civilized world.

Q. Can any natural causes be seen for these actual results?

A. Yes; the monkish life in either men or women 'forbids them to marry,' and thus prevents them from living in that safe and natural family state for which God made mankind. It also maintains a class of idle persons who must live upon the labors of others, and are also more tempted by evil thoughts to be covetous and sensual, than if they had some steady employment.

Q. Have approved writers of the Roman Church admitted this?

A. Yes; as when Cardinal Baronius says of the year 982: "Scarcely a vestige of religion appeared in the chief monasteries, while the covetousness of wealth, the evil *step-mother of monks* and root of evils, prevailed."† Of the shocking profligacy of both monks and nuns in Italy less than a hundred years ago, see proofs in the *Life of Ricci*, Bishop of Pistoria, by Roscoe.‡

Q. What excuse does the Roman Church give for keeping up these "orders," which produce such evils; while it *forbids the general reading of the Scriptures* only because there is danger that some may make a bad use of them?

A. That men and women may thus better keep what it calls "the *counsels* of perfection" of Christ; that is, can be more holy than the *commands* of God require.

Q. Does the word of God say any such thing as that?

A. No; it gives us two great "*commands* of perfection," namely, to *love God with all the heart*, and to *love others as ourselves*. To keep these IS TO BE PER-

* See the Roman Breviary for Aug. 4th, Oct. 4th, and Sept. 17th, and also the Lives of (Sts.) Dominic and Francis, founders of the two chief "orders."

† Annal. An. 982, p.

‡ Vol. i. p. 63-67, et passim.

FECTION. *Beyond them we never can go ; and up to them, probably, no one ever will come in this life. All of us, however, are bound to do our utmost to gain this perfection ; and if the best way to do it is to become a monk or a nun, then every soul ought to be one of these. But this, as all agree, would be absurd.*

Q. *Is this monkish life the best way to be virtuous and devout?*

A. We have already seen its ill effects where it has prevailed. The best and bravest way to serve God while we live in this evil world, is, to share its troubles and temptations with all our fellow-Christians ; to do our duty in that station of life in which it has pleased God to place us ; to shun every filthy thought, word and deed ; not to love riches, but be contented with a simple supply of our real wants, and have our real *treasure* in heaven ; and to *do all we do* to serve and please our Lord and Saviour. There are not a few examples among Protestants of such a good life as this ; and *all men may* follow it.



On the Charge of Ignorance made against Catholics.

DOCTRINAL CATECHISM.

Q. Did not the Reformation bring the blessing of learning into the world ?

A. Protestants attribute to the Reformation, what is due solely to the art of printing, discovered before the introduction of the new religion of Luther.

Q. Did the Catholics use the art of printing for the promotion of literature before Protestantism had a being ?

A. Before the end of the fifteenth century, printing presses were wrought in *thirty-four towns of France alone* ; and between the years 1455 and 1536, *twenty-two millions nine hundred and thirty-two thousand volumes had been printed.* The Popes, Nicholas V. and Sixtus IV., with the Princes and Kings of most European countries, were the munificent patrons of the

arts and sciences, (*Recherches sur les Bibliothèques*, pp. 82, 207, 233, 180.) Learning was in such a flourishing state in Germany, that ten Universities were founded between the years 1403 and 1506. Erasmus declares, that "Learning triumphed in England, that the King, the Queen, two Cardinals, and almost all the Bishops, exerted themselves in promoting it." (*Ad. Pet. Bembum*; Basileæ, 1518.) Indeed, all the Universities in Europe were founded by Catholics, and in Catholic times. During three hundred years, Protestants have shown their wish to promote learning by the erection of only two Universities, those of Dublin and London.

Q. By whom were the Universities of Scotland erected?

A. By Bishops and Popes: That of St. Andrew's, by the Catholic Bishop Wardlaw, under the sanction of Benedict XIII., in 1413; that of Glasgow, by Pope Nicholas V., aided by Bishops Muirhead and Turnbull, in 1450; that of Aberdeen, called King's College, by Pope Alexander VI., to which Bishop Elphinstone largely contributed. Even the Edinburgh University was projected by a Catholic Bishop, (Reid of Orkney,) who left eight thousand merks for that purpose. Indeed, every nation in Europe, by the proudest monuments, such as Oxford, Cambridge, Bologna, Sorbonne, Salamanca, bears irrefragable testimony to the untiring exertions of the Catholic Church for the promotion of the arts and sciences.

Q. Can you illustrate this matter by any additional consideration?

A. Yes; is not Europe indebted to Catholic Bishops and Popes for its civilization, its laws, and all its knowledge of the fine arts? Are not painting, sculpture, music, and architecture all completely and entirely Catholic? If you have any doubt, only look to the magnificent abbeys and cathedrals which have survived the fury of Vandalic reform, and which the barbarous hand of Protestantism has left only as interesting ruins, and you will be quickly convinced. No wonder, then, that the candid Colonel Mitchell, in his *Life of Wallenstein*, should declare, that "deep and indelible is the debt which RELIGION

AND CIVILIZATION OWE TO THE EARLY ROMAN PONTIFFS AND TO THE CHURCH OF ROME. They strove long and nobly to forward the cause of human improvement."

Q. Did not even the Monasteries possess large libraries and men of learning?

A. For this we have excellent Protestant authority. "The monasteries . . . had more opportunities for study than the secular clergy possessed . . . But their most important service was as secure repositories for books. All our manuscripts have been preserved in this manner." (Hallam, *Med. Ages*, vol. ii. p. 439.) "When the monks were settled in the reign of King Edgar, they promoted a general improvement; they were very industrious in restoring learning, and retrieving the country from the remarkable ignorance of these times." (Collier, *Hist. Ecclesiast.*) "*A little before the Reformation, many of the great monasteries were NURSERIES OF LEARNING; the SUPERIORS of monasteries were men of distinction.*" (Ibid.) Bishop Tanner says: "The monasteries were schools of learning and education."

Q. What was the order of Pope Gregory VII. to the Bishops of the Church?

A. He urged all the Bishops in Christendom to encourage literature and the arts, and to have each a school attached to his Cathedral Church. (Voigt, *Hist. Greg. VII.*, French Trans., p. 500.)

Q. What was the opinion of Burke, Gibbon, and Lord Hutchinson, as to Catholic learning?

A. The first declared, that "France alone had produced more eminent scholars than all the Protestant Universities of Europe;" the second said, that "One Monastery of Benedictine Monks gave to the world more works of learning than both the Universities of England;" and the third spoke thus to the British House of Lords: "Catholicity, which has this night been the subject of so much abuse, has been the belief of the most extensive and ENLIGHTENED nations of Europe, and of the most illustrious characters that ever did honor to the name of man." (Cob., *Letter i.*; Lingard's *Tracts*, p. 63.)

Q. Do not Protestant countries stand much higher, in modern times, as to education, comfort, and prosperity, than Catholic countries?

A. They turn their whole attention to worldly prosperity; religion gives them little concern; and hence it would not be very surprising if, in the above branches, they were in advance. That such, however, is not the case, you have only to read *Howitt's Life in Germany*—Tait, Feb. 1843; *Turnbull's Austria*, vol. i. p. 219; *Ibid.* vol. ii. pp. 66, 72; see also, p. 59; *Borrow's Bible in Spain*, chap. v. Even Dr. Welsh, in the General Assembly of 1835, admitted, that Scotland, "instead of being the very first in point of education, holds a very low place in respect of some Protestant, and I must," he says, "add, some ROMAN CATHOLIC COUNTRIES." This, from a minister, is a very large admission; and when taken in connection with the declaration of a British Secretary of State on the Factory question, "that Protestant England is the most ignorant Christian country in the world," and with the astounding proofs of spiritual and temporal ignorance laid before that Factory Commission must be considered as perfectly conclusive.

Q. What does Mr. Laing—Notes of a Traveller, pp. 435, 442—say as to the comparative state of Education?

A. In page 435, after saying that the poverty-stricken *intellectual* recluse is the Popish priest of the Nineteenth Century, he adds: "Our clergy in Scotland have a very erroneous notion of the state of the Popish clergy; . . . we often hear them prayed for, as men wallowing in luxury, and sunk in gross ignorance. This is somewhat injudicious, as well as uncharitable; for when the youth of their congregations . . . come in contact abroad with the Catholic clergy, so described, and find them in learning, liberal views, and genuine piety, according to their own doctrines, so very different from the description, and the *describers*, there will unavoidably arise comparisons . . . by no means edifying or flattering to their clerical teachers at home . . . Our Churchmen should understand better the strength of a formidable adversary, . . . who brings into the

field zeal and purity of life equal to their own. The education of the regular clergy of the Catholic Church, is, perhaps, positively higher, and, beyond doubt, comparatively higher, than the education of the Scotch clergy. By positively higher, is meant that, among a given number of Popish and of Scotch clergy, a greater proportion of the *former* will be found, who read with ease and a perfect mastery the ancient languages—Greek, Latin, and Hebrew—and the Eastern languages connected with that of the Old Testament—a greater number of profound scholars, a greater number of high mathematicians, and a higher average amount of acquired knowledge.” In page 442, he adds, “The Catholic clergy adroitly seized on education, and not, as *we suppose in Protestant countries, to keep the people in darkness and ignorance*, and to inculcate error and superstition, but to be at the head of the great social influence of useful knowledge.” Again, in page 439, alluding to the gross calumny, “that the Catholic clergy seek to keep their people in ignorance,” he scouts the impudent saying, in the following masterly style: “This opinion of our Churchmen seems more *orthodox*, than charitable or correct. *The Popish clergy have, in reality, less to lose by the progress of education than our own Scotch clergy.* In Catholic Germany, in France, Italy, and even Spain, the education of the common people, in reading, writing, arithmetic, music, manners, and morals, is, *at least*, as generally diffused, and as faithfully promoted, by the clerical body, as in Scotland, It is by their own advance, and not by keeping back the advance of the people, that the Popish priests of the present day seek to keep ahead of the intellectual progress of the community. Education is, in reality, not only *not repressed*, but *is encouraged, in the Popish Church, and is a mighty instrument in its hands, and ably used.* In every street in Rome, for instance, there are, at short distances, public primary schools, for the education of the children of the lower and middle classes. Rome, with a population of 158,678 souls, has 372 public primary schools, with 482 teachers, and 14,099 children attending them. Has Edinburgh so

many public schools for the instruction of those classes? I doubt it. Berlin, with a population about double that of Rome, has only 264 schools. Rome has also her University, with an average attendance of 660 students; and the Papal States, with a population of two and a half millions, contain seven universities. (Protestant) Prussia, with a population of fourteen millions, has only seven. . . . The statistical fact, that Rome has above a hundred schools more than Berlin, for a population little more than half that of Berlin, puts to flight a world of humbug. . . . Is it asked, what is taught to the people of Rome by all these schools? Precisely what is taught at Berlin, (*the most Protestant capital of the most Protestant country in the world*)—reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, languages, religious doctrine of some sort.” This ample attestation, given by an enemy, when looked at along with the extraordinary exertions that are made, now that the penal laws are done away with in Great Britain and Ireland, and other countries of Europe, by the Catholics of these countries in establishing schools, educational convents, and colleges, should, we think, open the eyes of the veriest bigot to this truth, that the Catholic Church loves learning, and promotes the arts and sciences.

On the Charge of Ignorance made against Catholics.

THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Is it the only or the worst fault of the Roman Church, that it does not favor the spread of useful knowledge among men?

A. No; if it faithfully upheld true religion this would be but a small matter. And, on the other hand, if it were the greatest friend of human learning, arts, and inventions, it would still be the greatest enemy of man in corrupting *the gospel of our soul's salvation and eternal life*, in the dreadful way which we have already proved. The fact is, however, that while it has favored those of the *arts* by which it might ornament its public buildings and make a fine *show* in pub-

lic worship, it has rather opposed all *useful studies* and *general knowledge among the people*; because these made men THINK FOR THEMSELVES; which it forbids.

Q. Have not learning and freedom greatly increased in the world since the Reformation?

A. Without doubt they have.

Q. Did this improvement begin before that event?

A. Yes; there was a sort of dawn before that rising of the sun on the dark world. Indeed, this partial revival of learning and freedom, especially as connected with the invention of printing, was one of the means by which our Lord brought about the Reformation.

Q. Did some Popes and other bishops of that Church favor this revival of learning?

A. Yes, at first. But when it became plain that this free inquiry, (especially a free reading of the Scriptures,) was opening the eyes of men to the great errors which prevailed in religion, they ceased to do so. So *the Council of Trent* established the "Prohibitory Index," that is, a list of *books that are not to be sold or read*. This "Index," as *now published at Rome*, is an almost complete list of all the books in the world, *that are worth reading*. It includes, beside the Holy Scriptures in any honest translation and without notes, (or even any way without the written permission of a bishop,) the works of *Galileo, Lord Bacon, Sir Isaac Newton, Milton, all the chief historians*, (with the remarkable exception of *the infidel Gibbon*,) etc., etc.

Q. Is it true that all the universities of Europe were founded by the Roman Church?

It is grossly false. The most famous of them, as Jena, Halle, Gottingen, Bonn, and Berlin, frequented by four or five thousand students, have been established since the Reformation, and by Protestants; and the best of the others have become *real nurseries of useful knowledge* only since then.* The same thing is seen in our own country, where the best teaching, as all candid men agree, is to be found in schools, colleges, and

* See Schaff's Germany, and Hallam's Mod. Lit. ii. 267.

universities founded and conducted by Protestants, by the side of which the education given in colleges of the Roman Church is quite contemptible.

Q. Were the monasteries (the great houses of the monks) favorable to learning?

A. Only in this way, that through the Dark Ages these monks and other priests kept all the learning (and that was not much) and all the books to themselves. So when a better age came, these books were found in their libraries by some who *would* read and *could* understand them. The Doctrinal Catechism refers to Mr. Hallam in favor of the monks: here is something which that writer does say in full: "If good learning, *bonæ literæ*, which for our present purpose means a sound knowledge of Greek and Latin, was to be promoted, there was no more necessary step in doing so than to put down *bad learning*, which is worse than ignorance, and *which was the learning of the monks*, so far as they had any at all. What would *Erasmus* have thought of one who should in his days have gravely intimated that the abolition of monastic foundations would retard the progress of literature? In what Protestant country was it accompanied with such a consequence, and from whom among the complaints sometimes made do we hear this cause assigned? The loss of a few schools in the monasteries was well compensated by the foundation of others *on a more enlightened plan* and with much better instructors." (Mod. Lit. i. 185-6.) So *Erasmus*: "Though this sort of men (the monks) are so detested by every one that it is reckoned unlucky so much as to meet them by accident, they think nothing equal to themselves, and hold it a proof of their consummate piety if *they are so illiterate as not to be able to read*. And when their asinine voices bray out in the churches their psalms which they can count but not understand, then it is they fancy that the ears of the saints above are enraptured with the harmony." (Encom. Mor.)

Q. What of "the opinion of Burke, Gibbon, and Lord Hutchinson"?

A. Mr. Burke made splendid and fanciful speeches,

and often said things like this which he could not soberly mean. Besides, it is not so much "eminent scholars" that we want as *knowledge for all the people*. So Mr. Gibbon speaks of "*works of learning*," by which he means the books of the old "Fathers," in Greek and Latin, published by the Benedictine monks with notes. Tell me, are these as valuable knowledge for you and me as all that Bacon, Newton, Boyle, Barrow, Herschel, Buckland, etc., have written? They might indeed seem so to Mr. Gibbon hunting in these old writings after material for sneers at our Lord and his Gospel. As for "Lord Hutchinson," *who is he?*

Q. How do Protestant and Roman countries compare in our day in regard to the knowledge and good sense of the people?

A. We have only to recall which these are to answer this at once. In America, the people of the *United States* are almost entirely Protestant, while those of *Mexico* are under the entire control of the Roman Church. In Europe, Holland is Protestant, Spain the other way; Sweden on one side, Naples on the other. In England almost every one can read and write; on the other hand, even in France, (which is as much infidel as Roman) nearly half of the men and much more than half of the women married last year could not write their names. (See Rep. of the Proc. Gen., 1856.) Thus the Roman Church, even while sharing some of the light of that Reformation which it curses, shows itself still THE CHURCH OF THE DARK AGES. All respectable writers (even Howitt, Turnbull, and Borrow, whom the Doctrinal Catechism has the assurance to refer to!) say the same of all Europe.

Q. How is it in the city of Rome and the "States of the Church," which are entirely under the influence of that Church and under the government of him whom it calls the "Vicar of Christ," and head of all Christians?

A. The great Niebuhr who lived many years at Rome, says, in a letter from there dated September 24, 1816: "I have been acquainted with *two or three* literary men of real ability; but they are old men who have only a few years to live; and when they are gone *Italy will be*, as they say themselves, *in a state of barbarism.*"

May, 1819: "Learning and literature are at a lower ebb than perhaps in any other country." (Life of Niebuhr.)* It is hard to tell whether the common people are more ignorant, superstitious, or profligate.

Q. What then must we think of "*Mr. Laing*," quoted by the Doctrinal Catechism to prove that Rome with half the population has half as much more good teaching for the people, as Berlin! and that the Papal States, with a sixth of the population of Prussia, have as great means for higher learning as all of that intelligent country?

A. Plainly "*Mr. Laing*" is mistaken.

Q. What do you say of the opinions of Dr. Welsh and the "British Secretary of State," which the Doctrinal Catechism gives?

A. It is strange that such men should venture to say such absurd things; so strange, that I suspect the Doctrinal Catechism is guilty here as at other times, of an utter falsehood.

Q. Give some really high and trustworthy facts and authorities upon this general question?

A. 1st, I quote from the sentence passed by the *Inquisition* AT ROME against the great Galileo, Feb. 25, 1616: "We do say, judge, and declare that you, the aforesaid Galileo, have upon account of those things which are produced in the written process, and which you have confessed as above, subjected yourself to a strong suspicion of *heresy* in this holy office by believing and holding to be true a doctrine which is *false and contrary to the sacred and divine Scripture*, namely, *that the sun is the centre of the orbit of the earth, and does not move from the East to the West*; and that *the earth moves*, and is not the centre of the world; and that these things may be considered and defended as probable opinions, although they have been *declared and determined to be contrary to the sacred Scriptures*; and, consequently, that you have incurred all the censures and penalties appointed and promulgated by the sacred canons, and other general and particular acts against such offenders; from which it is our pleasure

* *Twenty-eight times as many murders are committed as in England according to the population, and almost three fourths of the births are illegitimate! Though this rather proves that they have a horrible religious education.*

that you should be absolved, *provided* that you do first with a sincere heart and a true faith, *abjure, curse, and detest* before us, *the aforesaid errors and heresies*, and every other error and heresy *contrary to the Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church*, in the form which shall be prescribed to you by us." (Limborch Hist. Inq. l. iv. c. 40.)

2d. Alexander Pope, *himself a member of the Roman Church*, says of the Roman Church in the Dark Ages :

"With *tyranny* then *superstition* joined,
As that the *body*, this enslaved the *mind*;
Much was believed, but little understood,
And to be *dull*, was construed to be *good*;
A second deluge learning thus o'erran,
And the monks finished what the Goths began."*

3d. Mr. Macaulay, who far from being an earnest Protestant, was one of the chief supporters of "Catholic Emancipation" in England, and of the grant to Maynooth College, is forced, by the facts, to say of that Church in his History, (i. 47, 48.) "During the last three centuries *to stunt the growth of the human mind* has been her chief object. Throughout Christendom whatever advance has been made in knowledge, in freedom, in wealth, and in the arts of life, has been made *in spite of her*, and has every where been in inverse proportion to her power. The loveliest and most fertile provinces of Europe have, under her rule, been sunk in poverty, in political servitude, and in intellectual torpor, while Protestant countries, even proverbial for sterility and barbarism, have been turned by skill and industry into gardens, and can boast of a long list of heroes and statesmen, philosophers and poets. Whoever knowing what Italy and Scotland naturally are, and what four hundred years ago they actually were, shall now compare the country round Rome with the country round Edinburgh, will be able to form some judgment as to the tendency of Papal domination. The descent of Spain, once the first among monarchies, to the lowest depths of degrada-

* Essay on Criticism.

tion ; the elevation of Holland, in spite of many natural disadvantages, to a position such as no commonwealth so small has ever reached, teach the same lesson. Whoever passes in Germany from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant principality, in Switzerland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant canton, in Ireland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant county, finds that he has passed from a lower to a higher grade of civilization. On the other side of the Atlantic, the same law prevails. The Protestants of the United States have left far behind them the Roman Catholics of Mexico, Peru, and Brazil. The Roman Catholics of Lower Canada [may we not say, in part, of *Louisiana?*] remain inert, while the whole continent round them is in a ferment with Protestant activity and enterprise. The French have doubtless shown an energy and an intelligence which, even when misdirected, have justly entitled them to be called a great people. But this apparent exception, when examined, will be found to confirm the rule ; for in no country that is called Roman Catholic, has the Roman Catholic Church during several generations, possessed so little authority as in France."

My dear reader, perhaps it is *your Church* of which all this is so sadly true. Yet its thus opposing earthly knowledge would be a small matter if it did not *obscure the light that comes from heaven*, and so cause the incurable ruin of vast numbers of souls.



On the Charge of Uncharitableness.

DOCTRINAL CATECHISM.

Q. Are Catholics uncharitable to Sectarians ?

A. Certainly not ; since the Church teaches them to love all mankind, to pray for all, to forgive all, and to do good corporally and spiritually to all, irrespective of creed, country, or color.

Q. Does she not teach that there is no salvation out of the Church?

A. We have already proved that there is only one true Church, as there is only *one Lord, one faith, and one baptism*, and that the Catholic Church is that one true fold. Hence it is not only not uncharitable, but very charitable in Catholics to declare to the world what is laid down in Scripture, which teaches, that sects and heresies and schisms are sins which exclude from heaven. St. Paul declares, that "they that do such things, shall not inherit the kingdom of God." (Gal. 5 : 20, 21.)

Q. Do Catholics charge all that are apparently out of their communion with the crimes of heresy and schism, and consequently exclude them from salvation?

A. No; all baptized children who die before they sin *mortally*, and before they embrace and believe error, are members of the true Church. Again, all those sincere people belong to the soul of the Church, who, being baptized, and believing the great fundamental truths of Christianity, and who are prevented from believing it in all its details, not by carelessness, nor temporal interest, nor human respect, nor the spirit of obstinacy, nor by malice, but simply because they never doubted, and never had sufficient means of knowing the truth, which they would embrace at once, and with gladness, could they only discover it; all these, we say, belong to the soul of the Church, and will be saved, if they lead good lives and do not violate God's law.

Q. What do you mean by the soul of the Church?

A. All those belong to the body of the Church who are *openly* professing Catholics; to the soul of the Church belong all such as I have above described, who, being baptized, and believing the fundamental truths of religion, are living separate from the body of the Church, not by any fault of their own, but purely by not having sufficient means to lead them into a knowledge of the whole truth.

Q. Do Protestants expressly teach the very doctrine they unjustly blame in us, "exclusive salvation?"

A. Yes; the 16th Article of the *Old Presbyterian*

Confession says : " That there is one *Kirk* out of which *Kirk* neither life nor eternal felicity is to be hoped for." The 25th chap. of the *Westminster Confess.* declares, " that those who profess the true religion, (there can be only one religion true,) with their children, are the house of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation." The 18th chap. of the *Church of England Articles* declares, " that they also are to be had accursed, that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth." The same is the doctrine taught in the *Prot. Belgian Confess.*, 1561, and by the Synod of Dort, 1619. The *French Prot. Catechism*, Edit. 1710, p. 283, says : " Without doubt, out of the Church there is nothing but DEATH and DAMNATION." This is extraordinary doctrine to come from the lips of men who came out of the only Church in the world a few years before.

Q. What do you conclude from all this ?

A. That those pretended lovers of charitable doctrine must be very blind who look for such in any Protestant Communion.

On the Charge of Uncharitableness.

THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. In what sense do the Reformed Churches hold that there is no salvation out of the Church ?

A. In this ; that, since by the atonement of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, every man will be pardoned and saved who repents of his sins, and with a truly obedient heart trusts that God will mercifully forgive him ; so our Lord reckons all such among his people ; that is, *his Church*. Men may (and we doubt not do) do this who belong to different public communions, as the Greek, Roman, and various Reformed Churches ; as did the pious Israelites before the Gospel, and (we hope) even some in heathen lands in all ages, who grope after God, repent of their sins and trust only in his

mercy, though they have never yet known how it is given to men in our Lord and Saviour.

Q. Is there any intolerance in that?

A. Surely not.

Q. In what sense does the Roman Church say that there is no salvation out of the Church?

A. It claims to be *the whole* people of Christ, and ridicules the idea of an invisible and spiritual Church. According to this, no one *can be* in the Church of Christ who does not *publicly belong* to the *Roman Church*. It calls upon all Protestants to join it *because* they will otherwise be damned. Indeed there is *no avoiding this* according to its doctrines; as when it says by the Council of Trent: "Whoever shall deny that *sacramental confession* was instituted by divine command, or that it is *necessary to salvation*, etc., let him be accursed."* It also makes all its members say in the Creed of Pius IV., "I constantly hold that there is a purgatory," etc., and so of the "seven sacraments," transubstantiation, communion only with the bread, saint and image-worship, indulgences, etc., ending with these words, "This true Catholic FAITH out of which *none can be saved*," etc. MARK, it does not say, "this *Church*, to the soul of which one may be united, *though he has a different belief from the above*," but, "this FAITH, (that is, this *belief*,) OUT OF WHICH, NONE CAN BE SAVED."

Q. In what only sense then can it be true, so far as regards firm and sincere Protestants, that the Roman Church "teaches its members to do good corporally, and spiritually, to all, *irrespective of creed*," etc.?

A. In the sense of Cardinal Bellarmine when (as cited before on p. 397,) he says: "It is a benefit to obstinate heretics to remove them from this life, for the longer they live the more errors they invent, the more persons they mislead, and the greater damnation do they lay up for themselves."

* Labb. xx. 100. Of course not only does every honest Protestant deny this, and so is "*accursed*," but also he *never uses this "confession,"* which is "*necessary to salvation*."

Q. What then shall we say of the pretense that pious Protestants belong to *the soul* of the Roman Church, and so will be saved in it?

A. This is said to keep men from being shocked at its real doctrine. Do not you, reader, now know of some pious person who does not believe in "purgatory," etc., who is perhaps now reading "Both Sides," and yet still rejects the Creed of Pius IV., of whom it would be foolish to say that this was only because he "never had sufficient means of knowing the truth (meaning the Roman doctrine) which he would embrace at once with gladness could he only discover it," etc.? Do you not know some such godly person, and do you think that he will be condemned to hell for this?

Q. How does the Roman Church proclaim its real belief about this in the plainest way?

A. Every year in St. Peter's Church at Rome, on the day before Good Friday, in the name and presence of the Pope, and with great ceremony, is read the bull, "In Cœna Domini," in which, among other like words, are these: "In the name of God Almighty, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and by the authority of the blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul, and by our own, we *excommunicate* and *anathematize* all Hussites, Wickliffites, Lutherans, Zuinglians, Calvinists, Huguenots, Anabaptists, Trinitarians, and other apostates from the faith, and all other heretics by whatsoever name they are called or of whatever sect they be; and also their adherents and generally any defenders of them; with all who without our authority or that of the Apostolic See, knowingly read, or retain, or in any way or from any cause, publicly or privately, or from any pretext, defend their books containing heresy or treating of religion; as also schismatics, and those who withdraw themselves or recede obstinately from their obedience to us, or the existing Roman Pontiff," etc. "Excommunicated and accursed may they be, and given body and soul to the devil. Cursed be they in cities, in towns, in fields, in ways, in paths, in houses, out of houses, and all other places, standing, lying or rising, walking, running, waking, sleeping,

eating, drinking, and whatsoever things they do besides. We separate them from the threshold and from all prayers of the Church, from the holy mass, from all sacraments, chapels, and altars, from holy bread and holy water, from all the merits of God's priests and religious men, from all the pardons, privileges, grants, and immunities which all the holy fathers, the Popes of Rome, have granted; and we give them utterly over to the power of the fiend. And let us quench their soul, *if they be dead*, this night, *in the pains of hell-fire*," etc., etc.

Q. Is this intolerance?

A. It is more; it is the very spirit of bloody persecution. They who can say such things will not be slow to *do* the like whenever they have the power. "Their mouths are full of cursing and bitterness, and their feet are swift to shed blood." (Rom. 3 : 14.)

Q. Is there *any* Reformed Church which thus every year, or at any time, proclaims curses against those who have a different belief, or against any persons whatsoever?

A. No, never, nor any thing like it. My reader, perhaps you are now vexed with me for exposing the horrible uncharitableness of *your Church*. But why? It will be your own fault if you remain longer in such a Church.



On Heresy.

CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What is heresy?

A. An obstinate attachment to one's own private opinion, in opposition to what is declared an article of faith; and he is guilty of it, who prefers his own opinion to the declared doctrine of the universal Church; for example, if he hold obstinately any meaning he chooses to give to any portion of Scripture, which meaning is opposed to that given by the Church.

Q. Have all heretics pretended to prove their peculiar doctrines from Scripture?

A. All, without exception. The Arians denied the consubstantiality of the Word, depending on that passage of St. John, chap. 14: "*My Father is greater than I.*" The Macedonians denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit, on these words, Rom. 8 : 26 : "*The Spirit himself asketh for us with unspeakable groanings.*" The Manicheans pretended to prove, that Christ became man *only in appearance*, by Philip. 2 : 7 : "*Taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.*" The Nestorians fancied they proved, that in Christ there were two persons, by Coloss. 2 : 9 : "*For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead corporally.*" The Eutychians cited John chap. 1, "*and the Word was made flesh,*" to prove that Christ had only one nature; and the Pelagians founded their denial of original sin, on Ezech. 18 : 20 : "*The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father.*"

Q. What was the source of all these errors?

A. The presumptuous desire and determination of each Heresiarch to prefer his own interpretation of the Scripture, to that given by the whole Church?

Q. Were Luther and Calvin guilty of a similar irrational presumption?

A. They were shipwrecked on the same rock which had caused the ruin of all Heresiarchs that had gone before them. Calvin, for example, gave these words, "*This is my body,*" a figurative meaning, whilst the whole Church then existing, and the whole Christian world during fifteen hundred years, understood them in their natural sense. Luther explained these words, Rom. 3, "*Man is justified by faith without the works of the law,*" as dispensing with the necessity of good works, and the observing of God's commandments, whilst the whole Church understood these words to mean, that man is justified neither by the works of the natural nor of the Jewish law, but by faith in Jesus Christ, and by the works which proceed from that faith, having the grace of God for their source.

Q. Did Luther and Calvin act uniformly on this irrational principle of preferring each his own single individual judgment to that of the whole Church?

A. Yes; such was the principle upon which they grounded each article of their new faith.

Q. Can Luther, or any of his followers, be excusable before God, seeing that each one of them prefers, in the interpretation of Scripture, his own one light, and his own one judgment, to the light and judgment of the whole Church?

A. Certainly not; for to such individual we say: Either you believe that you are *fallible* in the interpretation which you give the Scripture, or you hold that you are *infallible*; if you say you are fallible, then your faith is uncertain and vacillating, and, consequently, is not faith at all; but if you say you are infallible, then your absurd presumption drives you to assert, that the *whole Church* may err in her interpretation of Scripture, but that *you individually* can interpret it with *infallible* certainty!!

Q. What can he reply to this dilemma?

A. We defy him to make any satisfactory reply; he being either the victim of perplexity, or the dupe of the most insupportable obstinacy.

On Heresy

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What is the natural result of the notion that nothing can be wrong which the Church seems to say?

A. To make it impossible for any false doctrine which the greater part of the Church may at any time fall into to be corrected, however plain the word of God may be against it. Because this majority will say in the name of "the Church" that the Scriptures must not be understood in what is their real meaning, but in some way which agrees with the false doctrine.

Q. What other danger is there in this notion, beside that of false doctrine?

A. There is great danger of *tyranny*; for all free inquiry and discussion are then likely to be forbidden, and we will be told that all we have to do is to hear and believe what *the Church* says.

Q. Who would be most likely to insist upon this rule and carry it out where they had the power?

A. Common-sense says that it would be those whose doctrines were false and foolish. For those whose belief agreed with Scripture and reason, would be ready and even desirous to have it tried by them.

Q. What plain *rule* of religion has God given us by which we may know what to believe and to do in order to please him and to be saved?

A. His own words written in the Holy Bible.

Q. Shall we think that this is not a plain and sure rule, because all men do not agree about the meaning of it all, and some even argue from it for false doctrines?

A. No; IT IS PLAIN about all matters necessary to salvation;* and as for those who "wrest it to their own destruction" by false doctrines, they do it purposely, and there is no help for it: they will answer to God for this dreadful crime. But when I see plainly what the word of God means, shall I refuse to believe it because some one is unfair and foolish enough to say that it means something else? Need I doubt for a moment what God means when he says, "Thou shalt not steal;" and must I wait for the Church to tell me, because some one chooses to say that it does not forbid him to be dishonest?

Q. How, among other things, does this rule differ from that of a blind following of the Church?

A. Unlike that, it leaves room and even gives the best chance for correcting false doctrine by free discussion, and does not make most Christians the slaves of a few others.

Q. What do you say of the "dilemma" stated by the Doctrinal Catechism on p. 437?

* Even the Doctrinal Catechism admits that some Protestants believe "the fundamental doctrines of Christianity." (See p. 431.) It is these foundation matters of belief and salvation which are so plain in the Scripture.

A. It *takes for granted* that each single Protestant has "the whole Church," that is, all the Christians in the world, against him, and that it is therefore "absurd presumption" in him to read the plain meaning of the word of God. This argument is an "absurd presumption." Besides, if it means by "the whole Church," first, a man called a "Pope," it is then one man against another; and what "absurd presumption" is there in my not giving up my honest reading of the Scriptures for what he says; or, secondly, if it means a majority of all the Christians in the world, what reason have I to think that if the whole matter were fairly explained to them all, and left to their free judgment, they would decide it as they are now *compelled to profess*? and if they should, is a majority of even *one* in three hundred millions *infallibly right* and the other side certainly wrong? Surely a most "*absurd presumption*"!

We do not claim to be "infallible:" we rely upon the *Scripture* as the *infallible truth of God*. But we use our senses and reason to find out what the Scripture says. Why can not God speak in a book at least as plainly as men can? A member of the Roman Church looks to "the Church" as *infallible*. How does he know (or think he knows) what the true Church is? By his senses and reason; by some sort of thinking. How does he then know *what that Church says*? Again by his senses and reason, by listening to a priest or bishop, or reading books. If he then can find out what *the infallible Church* says by hearing men and reading various books, *why can not I find out what the infallible God says by reading in his book*? WHY?

All this argument by which the Roman Church tries to enslave other men to a priesthood starts with the false notion that God himself can not use words as plainly as they can; that he needs "an interpreter" to speak to you; and who should it be but they? If some one who could speak your language well was talking to you in it, would you need "an interpreter"? And if another person were to tell you that since you were "fallible," your belief of *what you were hearing*

with your own ears was “uncertain and vacillating,” and so you had better let him *interpret* to you, would you trust him? Beware then of this cheat.

CHAP. II.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Have you observed any peculiarities which have uniformly accompanied every important heresy that has made its appearance in the Christian world?

A. Yes; five peculiarities are always observable. First, Every Heresiarch presumed to blame the Church with having fallen into pernicious error; secondly, These Heresiarchs, with their adherents, always separated themselves from the Church; thirdly, They uniformly taught *new doctrines*, unknown till then in the Christian world; fourthly, They always gave their own name, or the name of their country, or the name of their new dogmas, to their followers; fifthly, Not one of them could ever prove that he had a lawful mission.

Q. Have you observed the same traits in the Heresiarchs Luther and Calvin?

A. Yes; like Arius, Macedonius, Nestorius, and Eutyches, they blamed the Church—they separated themselves from her—they taught *new doctrines*—they gave their names to their followers—and they were unable to prove a lawful mission.

Q. How do you prove that Luther, for example, taught new dogmas?

A. We defy him or any of his followers to name even one country, one parish, or even one village, which, from the time of Christ until Luther appeared, ever taught, that there are only two sacraments—that the Mass is an abomination—the invocation of saints, idolatry—Purgatory, a superstition—and the Pope, Antichrist.

Q. Have you remarked any other peculiarity as often as any new doctrine appeared in the Church?

A. We can always name the author of such new creed—tell the place and time where it made its first

appearance—give the names of the first men who opposed it—and point out the Council which condemned it. Thus, we know that ARIUS, in the YEAR 315, in ALEXANDRIA, a city of Egypt, was the first to teach, that Christ Jesus was not equal to the Father, and we know, that this error was combated by the PATRIARCH ALEXANDER and by St. ATHANASIUS, and that it was CONDEMNED BY THE FIRST COUNCIL OF NICE.

Q. Do we observe the same peculiarities, as to the new doctrine of Luther?

A. Exactly the same. That doctrine made its first appearance at WITTEMBERG, in Saxony, in the YEAR 1517; it had LUTHER for its author; was COMBATED BY ALL THE UNIVERSITIES to which he appealed; and was finally CONDEMNED BY THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

Q. What other marks of novelty do you discover in Luther's doctrine?

A. Three other marks. That doctrine was at first embraced by *very few*; *all* those who embraced it, had been previously taught a *very different doctrine*; and its appearance gave rise to great confusion, amazement, and sedition.

Q. May it not be said, that Luther taught nothing new, but merely reëstablished what the Apostles taught?

A. This reply is justly suspected, because it was the reply of every Heresiarch that appeared in the world.

Q. How do you refute this assertion?

A. The doctrine of the Apostles could never cease to be taught, because Christ declared *he would be with his Apostles teaching ALL DAYS even to the consummation of the world*; but the doctrine of Luther was not only not taught, it was not even known before his own time; therefore, the doctrine of Luther was not the doctrine of the Apostles.

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What must be said of this whole chapter of the Doctrinal Catechism?

A. It merely assumes and repeats what we have already seen to be false; as that the doctrines of the Reformed Churches were never known before Luther, etc., etc. Those doctrines have always been in the Holy Scriptures, were never entirely forgotten in the darkest times of the Universal Church, and are held even now in the main by the Roman Church, though mixed with human inventions which overshadow and injure them.

Q. What of knowing any thing to be a false doctrine because you can "name the author, tell the place," etc.?

A. This is childish. It would prove the Gospel of our Lord to be a heresy! For I can name all these things of it even to the Council (that of the old Jewish Church held by the High Priest) which condemned it.

Q. How does the Doctrinal Catechism "refute this assertion" that the Reformed doctrine was the pure Gospel preached by the Apostles?

A. By an argument which amounts to this: "The Church never did err, *because*—it never *did* err. Luther's doctrine was never known before his time *because*—it never *was* known before his time."

 CHAP. III.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Were Luther and Calvin better able to prove their mission, than were Arius, Macedonius, or Nestorius?

A. No; in this they had the very same difficulty to contend with as had these Heresiarchs.

Q. How did the Catholics prove to the reforming leaders that they had no mission?

A. They said to them: Your ecclesiastical superiors

have not sent you to preach or baptize ; therefore you have no ordinary mission : but neither have you an extraordinary mission ; for, if you were sent immediately and directly by God himself, you would have been able to prove this, like Moses or our Saviour, by working miracles.

Q. Did Luther himself admit, that no man could preach unless he had one or other of these missions ?

A. Yes ; addressing the Anabaptist preachers, he says : “ If you are sent by man, show us your patent ; if by God, let us see you working miracles.” (German Edit. t. 5, p. 491-6.) He forgot, however, this embarrassing dilemma, when the Catholics, with much more justice, applied it to himself.

Q. Could not Luther, who was a priest of the Catholic Church, reply, that he had power and commission from her to preach the true doctrine contained in the Scripture ?

A. Either the Catholic Church was at that time the true Church, or she had ceased to be such ; if she was then the true Church, it was unlawful for Luther to separate from her, and she could not give him a commission to preach a doctrine contrary to her own ; but if she had ceased to be the true Church, then she was not qualified to give any commission at all.

Q. As then Luther and Calvin had evidently no mission, either ordinary or extraordinary, in what light are we to regard them and their successors in the ministry ?

A. As wolves in sheep's clothing, who have entered the fold, not by the door, but over the wall ; of whom Christ says, that they come not to feed, but to devour the sheep.

CHAP. III.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What “mission” had the ministers who joined in the Reformation, (especially the Bishops and other clergy of the Church of England,) thus to call the Church back from the great corruptions into which it had fallen ?

A. They had in the Holy Scriptures the command of the King of the Church, our Lord Jesus Christ, to

preach his Gospel and to speak boldly against all false religion.

Q. Were they then lawful and regular pastors in the Church?

A. They had been chosen and ordained as such just as well as those bishops and priests who took the other side.

Q. Had they no right to reform the Church because they had been made pastors in it while it was corrupt? If the Church held false doctrine when they received authority to preach, were they bound to preach that false doctrine after they saw the error?

A. By no means. A soldier in the army of this country would be bound to oppose the very officer who had mustered him into service, if he caught him playing the traitor to the country. So the pastors of the Church had their authority and owed their service, *directly to our Lord*. When the Church chose them and set them apart as ministers, it only acted *in the name of Christ*, and bound them to obey *him*. Therefore when they or any of them saw that that Church had gone away from his commandments, they not only had *a right* to protest against this, and to call the Church back to its duty; but if they *had not* done it, they would have been false to their vows.

Q. Are these "ministers then and their successors to be regarded as wolves in sheep's clothing," etc.?

A. We are indeed told to beware of false teachers, as "wolves in sheep's clothing;" but we are also told, "Ye shall know them"—(How? By their not adhering to "the chair of Peter"? By their not being in communion with "the Holy Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all churches"? No; *there is nothing like this in Scripture*, but, "*Ye shall know them*") BY THEIR FRUITS."

And now that we have fairly examined the chief matters in which the Roman Church differs from the Reformed, it seems most proper to inquire into this, namely:

*The Corruption of the Church foretold by the
Holy Apostles.*

Q. In what words is this stated by St. Paul?

A. First, In 1 Tim. 4 : 1-3, etc. : " Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that *in the latter time some shall depart from the faith*, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils ; speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron, *forbidding to marry*, and *commanding to abstain from meats*, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth," etc.* Now certainly either the separation of the Reformed Churches from the Roman, three hundred and fifty years ago, or else such a corruption and neglect of the doctrines of Holy Scripture as they said had taken place in the Dark Ages, is such a " departing from the faith ;" and which answers best to St. Paul's words ?

Q. How does St. Paul speak of the same thing elsewhere ?

A. In 2 Thess. 2 : 3-11 : " Let no man deceive you by any means, for that day (of judgment) shall not come *except there come a falling away first*, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped ; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." (As the Pope is called " the Vicar of Christ," " His Holiness," and even " our Lord God the Pope ;" as (St.) Antoninus says that " there is no less honor due unto the Pope than unto the angels of God. Therefore, the Pope suffereth the faithful *to worship him and to fall down before him and to kiss his feet*, which things the angel of God *would not suffer* St. John the Evangelist to do unto him." (Sum. Theol. par. iii. tit. 22, c. v. 4, as cited by Jewell.) But most of all, as every Pope

* " Now the Spirit manifestly saith that in the last time, some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to spirits of error and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, and having the conscience seared, forbidding to marry, to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving by the faithful, and by them that have known the truth."—Douay Bible. -

after his election is *placed upon the great altar* of St. Peter's Church, and *ADORED* by all the people. This is called in the Roman Pontifical, "THE ADORATION OF THE POPE.") "*Remember ye not that when I was yet with you I told you these things. And now ye know what withholdeth, that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work,* [this leaning to superstition which came to such a fearful pass in the Dark Ages had begun even in St. Paul's time,] *only he who now letteth [preventeth] will let until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming; even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved.* [My reader, let not this be your case.] And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie," etc.* How terrific and yet how true a picture this is of what is seen among many called Christians to this day; and how the last words describe the obstinacy with which unhappy men, perhaps some readers of this book, will cling to their errors after these have been exposed!

Q. Where do you find this falling away still more fully described?

A. In the Revelation or Apocalypse of St. John, in which the history of the Church is foretold with mysterious and sublime images. This was meant for our in-

* "Let no man deceive you by any means; for unless there come a revolt first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and is lifted up above all that is called God, or that is worshipped so that he sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself as if he were God. Remember you not that when I was yet with you I told you these things? And now you know what withholdeth, that he may be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity already worketh; only that he who now holdeth do hold until he be taken out of the way. And then that wicked one shall be revealed whom the Lord Jesus shall kill with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming; him whose coming is according to the working of Satan in all power and signs and lying wonders, and in all seduction of iniquity to them that perish because they receive not the love of the truth that they might be saved. Therefore God shall send them the operation of error to believe a lie," etc.—Douay Bible.

struction, and we have no right to neglect it ; it begins by saying : " IF ANY MAN HAVE AN EAR LET HIM HEAR." It repeats this warning many times, and we dare not disobey. A corrupt church is then described in these terrible words : " And there came one of the seven angels which had the seven vials, and talked with me, saying unto me, Come hither, I will show unto thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon many waters ; with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication. So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness. And I saw a woman sit upon a *scarlet-colored* beast *full of names of blasphemy*, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in *purple and scarlet color*, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication. And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints and of the martyrs of Jesus ; and when I saw her I wondered with great admiration. The seven heads are *seven mountains on which the woman sitteth*. And the woman which thou sawest is that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth."* (Rev. 17 : 1-6, 9, 18.) This is the Church of Rome.

* " And there came one of the seven angels who had the seven vials, and spoke with me saying : Come, I will show thee the condemnation of the great harlot who sitteth upon many waters. With whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and they who inhabit the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her prostitution. And he took me away in the spirit into the desert. And I saw a woman sitting upon a scarlet-colored beast full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was clothed round in purple and scarlet, and gilded with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of the abomination and filthiness of her fornication. And on her forehead a name was written : A mystery, Babylon the Great, the mother of the fornications and abominations of the earth. And I saw the woman drunk with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus. And when I had seen her I wondered with great admiration. The seven heads are seven mountains upon which the woman sitteth. And the woman which thou sawest is the great city which hath dominion over the kings of the earth."—Douay Bible.

Q. What reasons have we for believing that Babylon here means Rome?

A. *Rome*, and *Rome alone*, was in the days of St. John, "*that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth.*" *It* and *it alone* has always been known as *the city of the seven mountains*. It resembles the Babylon of Chaldea in many things in such a wonderful manner that *from the earliest times of the Church* it has been called *the new Babylon*. But most of all, the description of "*the woman*" agrees with the Roman Church (as we shall see presently) and to nothing else in history.

Q. How did the early Christian writers understand this prophecy?

A. Though none of these things had then been fulfilled as we see them now, still even they could not mistake some part of the description. Beginning with Papias, who lived in the very days of St. John, and continuing down through Irenæus, Tertullian, Victorinus, Jerome, Augustine, etc., all agree that the Babylon of St. John meant *ROME*, and that he called it by the mystical name of Babylon, so as not to attract the jealous hatred of the Pagan Emperors. Even Cardinals Bellarmine* and Baronius, and Bossuet, admit this.

Q. What proves that this is not only Rome but the Church of Rome?

A. It could not be Pagan Rome, because the woman's being *a harlot* represents a *false church*, which had been treacherous to Christ the Divine Spouse; as the pure Church is his spotless Bride. (See Ezek. 16 : 15-59.) So all "*the Fathers*" in the days of Pagan Rome understood it, and looked for something yet to come, to fulfill this prophecy. So soon, however, as the power of the Popes and other such false doctrines became very plain, it was applied to Christian Rome. (St.) Gregory, *a bishop of Rome*, had already said (see p. 205) that whoever called himself universal Bishop, showed himself by that to be Anti-Christ. His own successors soon fulfilled this, and have now for twelve hundred years. Even through the Dark Ages this prophecy of St. John was plainly

* De Sum. Pont. c. vi.

seen and declared by some writers (among them the great Italian poet Dante) to mean the Roman Church. Of course all who dared to say so were persecuted by its terrible power.

Q. In what things does the Roman Church fulfill this prophecy ?

A. In these, with many others : 1st, It is a "harlot" in that though once a true wife, that is, a pure Church, it has become false and filthy in corrupt doctrine and vicious conduct. 2d, "Purple and scarlet" are the colors for the attire of its Popes and Cardinals. 3d, It is "full of names of blasphemy," pretending to forgive sins by the voices of its priests, reviling the Holy Scriptures and forbidding men to read them, and giving divine honors to Mary and other "saints," and to the Popes. 4th, "The kings of the earth have committed fornication with it and the inhabitants of the earth have been drunk with the wine of its fornication" in this ; that it has forbidden men their right to think for themselves and joined with tyrants to oppress the people. 5th, It has pursued with such merciless slaughter the brave Christians who have in different ages contended for the pure Gospel, that it is reeling "drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus," "slain for the word of God and for the testimony which they held,"* whose souls now cry to him from under the altar of heaven.

Q. Has all this prophecy been yet fulfilled ?

A. No ; for the terrible *fall* of this Babylon and the triumphant rejoicings which will be on earth and in heaven over it, are also foretold in words of awful majesty in the 18th and 19th chapters ; and God calls from heaven to all devout persons yet remaining in that Church : "COME OUT OF HER, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues ; for her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities."†

* Rev. 6 : 9, 10.

† 18 : 4, 5 : "Go out from her, my people ; that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached even to heaven ; and the Lord hath remembered her iniquities."
—Douay Bible.

Q. What should you learn from this?

A. That this great fall of the Roman Church may not be far off, and that I must not be found sharing in it.



The Protestant "Rule of Faith" Examined.

CHAP. I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. You have said much already on the rule of faith; still, as it is a very important question, I should like a more full exposition of the three false rules generally followed by Protestants, and then a brief but clear statement of the Scriptural grounds upon which the Catholic rule of faith rests?

A. You shall be gratified, as far as our brief space will allow.

Q. What say you, then, to the rule of the Socinian? He admits that the Scripture is inspired, but that reason is to be the interpreter of that Divine revelation, and that nothing is to be admitted, but what reason can clearly comprehend?

A. We reply, in the first place, God is infinite, we are finite; hence, he can reveal many things of which we understand nothing except the facts revealed—such are, for example, the Unity and Trinity of God, the Creation, the Incarnation, etc. Now, can reason be our guide in things which it can not comprehend? Will presumptuous, finite reason pretend to fathom the unfathomable abyss of God's infinite wisdom and power? Will it blasphemously tell God, that it will believe nothing but what it can understand—that it will believe nothing on God's word, unless he condescend to explain its nature? Secondly, reason is fallible; hence it can not be the foundation of *faith*, which excludes all doubt; it can only be the foundation of *opinion*. Only open the pages which contain the sad history of man; look at the molten idols of ancient Rome, and the garden gods of ancient Egypt—at the contradictions and absurdities of Pagan and Christian schools, guided entirely by human reason, and you will be satisfied, that

there is nothing ridiculous, gross, absurd, or shameful, which erring reason has not taught; and if so, surely it can not be a *secure* rule of faith. Thirdly, all the sects in the world professing Christianity, agree in denouncing the Socinian or Unitarian rule, and their creed founded on that rule. Most certainly, therefore, it is safer to follow the overwhelming majority of Christians, than to risk our salvation upon a rule lately adopted by a handful of men, who have no claim to the title of Christian, since they deny one of the fundamental articles of Christianity—the Divinity of Christ.

Q. Have you any other argument against this rule?

A. Yes, many. The reasons or judgments of men are as different as their faces; hence, an infinite variety of religions would be formed under the direction of reason. Look at our contradictory systems of medicine, philosophy, politics, and agriculture, and say: If such is the case in secular sciences, should we not have the same Babylonish confusion as regards religion, if reason were admitted as supreme judge? Should we not, in that case, have as many creeds as there are men—as many varieties in religion, as there are different grades of strong or weak, polished or unpolished, reason amongst men? In fine, the very rule of the Socinian is a contradiction to his reason. The Christian rule is much more rational. God reveals certain truths, many of which are mysteries. The Socinian says: What I understand of these, I will believe; what my reason does not comprehend, I will reject; and thus an insolent *creature*, who is the mere work of God's hand—who does not understand even himself—who can not comprehend half the mysteries which exist in and around him every moment, dares to disbelieve God's word, unless God condescend to explain all to him. How *irrational* is such conduct! The Christian, on the contrary, when a mystery is proposed, seeks sufficient proof of the fact of revelation; satisfied on this head, he believes at once. God is infinitely *good*, he says, therefore he can not deceive me; he is infinitely *wise*, therefore he can not be deceived himself; whatever he reveals must be true; therefore I believe it, whether I

understand it or not. We may, then, sound as we please the depths of worldly science; in this we are confined to no bounds; but in religion we have prescribed limits. It is a *positive* institution—"Thus far shalt thou go, and no further."

The Protestant "Rule of Faith" Examined.

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What do you say to this chapter?

A. I have nothing to say to it, as it is *not* about "the Protestant rule of faith." What is said here about the worldly and foolish presumption of the Socinians is, perhaps, well enough; though the same error has been much more wisely exposed by other writers.

CHAP. II.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What say you to the rule adopted by the Baptists, Quakers, Moravians, and Methodists, which consists in a supposed private inspiration made by God to each individual?

A. The conduct of those who adopted this delusion is its best refutation. Montanus and Maximilla were the first who adopted it, and they both *hanged themselves*. (Euseb. Eccl. Hist., lib. v.) The followers of Carlostad were *privately inspired by God*, "to despoil and kill all the wicked." (Sleidan, De Statu Rel. et Reip. Comment. lib. iii. p. 45.) John Bockhold, following his *inspiration*, declared himself king of Sion; he married eleven wives, and, by order of *his spirit*, put them all to death. (Hist. de la Reform. par Ger Brandt.) Herman was *inspired* to declare himself the Messiah—to order that all priests and magistrates should be killed. (Brandt, p. 51.) David George declared himself the true son of God. (Mosheim, v. iv. p. 484.)

Such were the foreign Protestants who followed private inspiration as a rule of faith.

Q. Were the English followers of this rule more moderate than their continental brethren?

A. No; Nicholas taught, that faith and worship were useless—that men should continue in sin, that grace might abound. (Brandt, p. 51.) For the doings of Hacket's and Venner's private inspiration, see Fuller's Hist. of the Church, p. 9, and Echard's Hist. of Eng. Fox, according to Penn's Journal, declared the Scripture only a secondary rule, subject to the spirit; and one of his party entered the Parliament House with a drawn sword, saying, he was authorized by the Holy Spirit to kill every man that sat in that house. (Macclaine's Note on Mosheim, v. v. p. 470.) James Naylor was *inspired* to have himself hailed as the "Prince of peace, the rose of Sharon, and the fairest of ten thousand." (Echard.) Wesley says of the Moravians, that many of them did not read the Scriptures, pray, or communicate, because that was seeking salvation by works. "Some of our English brethren say," he adds, "you will never have faith, till you leave off the Church and the sacraments; as many go to hell by praying as by thieving." (Journal, 1740.) Such were the impious and blasphemous fruits of the rule called "private inspiration."

Q. These unquestionable facts are shocking evidences against that rule—have you any additional argument to offer?

A. In the first place, the true rule of faith is a rule for all, whilst, with the exception of these few deluded Protestant fanatics, no body of Christians ever felt, or even pretended to feel, that they were privately inspired by God; therefore, the great mass of Christians have ever been, and now are, without any rule of faith; and is this at all reconcilable with God's goodness and mercy? Secondly, Those who adopted this rule directly contradicted the Scripture. Their *spirit* told them to murder; the Scripture says, "Thou shalt not kill." The spirit told them to sin, that grace might abound—the Scripture forbids all sin. Nay, they contradicted one another. The same Spirit of God taught

one thing to Wesley, and another to Bockhold—one to Joanna Southcote, and another to Fox. Finally, the Spirit of God, say these fanatics, teaches us what we are to believe and what we are to do; but can they prove that it, in reality, is the Spirit of God, and not the spirit of error? (for, from their works, hinted at above, it would appear that the latter is their guide.) No, they can not; for, in order to do so, they should work some unquestionable miracle; but in this they have never succeeded. What wise man, therefore, would be weak enough to abandon the Scripture, constant tradition, and Church authority, and deliver his soul to the guidance of such self-sent, foolish, and wicked pretenders to inspiration? They are guided by a spirit, but it is evidently the spirit of fanaticism, darkness, and error.

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What do you say of this chapter?

A. The same as of the preceding. The Doctrinal Catechism seems to have named over as many of the impious follies of vain and delirious men as it could find in the history of Protestant countries. Yet these were condemned by every respectable Reformed Church. On the other, to show what has been said and done in the Roman Church and been *favoured* and *honored* by it, I quote from the Breviary and the "Lives of the Saints," a few instances out of the vast mass with which I might fill a hundred pages. "He (St. Ignatius Loyola) passed a year subduing his flesh by a rough chain and hair cloth, lying on the ground and *bloodying himself with iron whips.*" (Brev. July 31.) "She (St. Juliana) was wont to *bruise her body with scourges, knotted little ropes, iron girdles*, watchings, and sleeping on the naked ground; she partook very sparingly of food, and that of a mean sort, four days of the week, *on the other two she was content with only angel's food*: besides, on Saturday she was nourished on bread and water only." (June 19.) "She (St. Rose) deserved

to hear Christ speak to her and say, *Rose of my heart, be thou my bride.*" (Aug. 30.) "When she was occupied at her needle-work, *Christ often quietly sat upon the cushion* and spoke to the heart of this beloved one *with silent nods*, and with every gesture openly declared his divine love." (Bull. of can. of St. Rose.) "Every day after dinner, he (St. Philip de Neri) began to teach those who came to him frequently seated on his bed, *because he was sick with the love of God.* What is wonderful to be told, during these conferences he felt that power of divine love that at one time *he shook violently all over his body*, at another, *he was lifted up into the air*, so that you would believe he was there held by some one; and at other times *the bed itself seemed so to nod and vibrate* that YOU WOULD HAVE SUPPOSED IT WAS AN EARTHQUAKE." (Acta Sanct. vi. 471.) With such "saints," with its blasphemous worship of Mary, and with its bloody persecutions, the Roman Church talks of "the spirit of fanaticism, darkness, and error," and "the impious and blasphemous fruits of the rule called private interpretation"!

CHAP. III.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What is the third false rule of faith?

A. That of the respectable portion of Protestants, who maintain, that the Bible, and the Bible *only*, and the Bible, not as it sounds, or as it is understood by the learned, but as it is understood by each private individual, whether ignorant or learned, is the rule of faith, given by a wise and good God to mankind.

Q. Have you many arguments against this pretended rule?

A. Yes, very many. The first of which is derived from a comparison of this Protestant with the Catholic rule of faith?

Q. What is the Catholic rule of faith?

A. All truly inspired Scripture, and all truly *divine tradition*, (see Chap. on Tradition,) interpreted, not by

the ignorant, nor even the learned laity, but by the *lawfully sent and ordained* pastors of God's true Church.

Q. In comparing these rules, why do you give a preference to the Catholic rule?

A. Even at this moment, there are seven Catholics for one Protestant in the world; hence, we have seven to one in favor of our interpretation of Scripture, and in favor of our rule; we have, in addition to this, the whole world during fifteen hundred years before Luther; and all this is confirmed by the fact, that whilst all Catholics, of every age and country, agree as to the rule of faith and its interpretation, no two sects of Protestants are agreed upon every question of religion; nor do they give their rule of faith one and the same interpretation—each *individual* Protestant explains the Scripture for himself, whilst each Catholic has the Scripture explained by all that is at present, or ever was, wise, learned, great, or good, in God's Church. The Protestant has only the security of his own *one* judgment; the Catholic has that of the *whole* Church.

Q. Is there any thing absurd in this trait of Protestantism?

A. Can any thing be more absurd, than that an ignorant peasant should pretend to interpret the Inspired Volume better than all the pastors of the Church?

Q. Would it be less absurd, if only learned Protestants pretended to do so?

A. Very little indeed; since they can be only considered a handful, when compared with the learned body of the Catholic Church: if, as the Scripture says, "*There be wisdom among many counsellors,*" truth will be on the side of Catholicism; we have the learning of eighteen centuries—Protestants have only that of three.

Q. What is your next argument?

A. During three hundred years, the Bible, as privately interpreted, has been the rule of Protestants; now, if it had been the rule intended by God, all

Protestants would have been of one faith—they would have given the same interpretation to every passage. But the reverse is the case. Luther taught the real presence out of the Bible—Zuinglius, out of the same book, taught the contrary—the Church of England teaches one doctrine, the Kirk of Scotland another, the Evangelical Church of Prussia a third, and yet all follow the Bible, and interpret for themselves. They have proved the Bible, as privately interpreted, to be the fruitful source of delusions, heresies, and schisms.

Q. Is it not clear, that there can be only one true faith, as there is only one Lord, one baptism, one revelation, which can have only one true sense?

A. Yes, beyond all doubt; and the Protestant rule destroys this unity of faith. Let each man interpret the Bible for himself, and you will have, as is evident from our swarms of Protestant sects, as many religions as there are different heads and judgments.

Q. May not the ministers restrain these sects by forcing all to accept their interpretation?

A. No; for this would be in contradiction to their own principles; it would be destroying the right of private interpretation.

Q. Does not the Protestant rule facilitate the teaching of all sorts of error, and this without the possibility of applying an antidote?

A. Yes, clearly. For example, an ignorant Unitarian cobbler denies the divinity of Christ, on these words: "The Father is greater than I." It will be of no use for a Protestant minister to quote against him that other passage, "I and the Father are one;" for the cobbler will reply, that their unity is a unity of affection, not of nature, and this he will say is evident from the former passage. The minister must leave him in his error; for the cobbler will tell him he has a right to interpret Scripture for himself, and that he is as good a judge as any minister.

Q. If the Bible be the only rule of faith, should not Protestants be able to tell us, with certainty, of what, and how many books the Bible is composed?

A. Certainly; yet this they can not do. They have never agreed amongst themselves on this head; they

reject nine or ten books which we admit. St. Paul to the Hebrews, St. James, the second of St. Peter, the third of St. John, St. Jude, and the Apocalypse, have been all successively admitted and rejected by Protestants. Their opinions, so often changed, show they have no certainty as to what books really constitute the Bible; and, consequently, the Bible can never be for them a *certain* rule of faith.

Q. What say you as to the books of Scripture which are lost, alluded to in Num. 21 : 14; 1 Kings 4 : 32; Chron. 9 : 29; 1 Cor. 1 : 9; Matt. 27 : 9; Matt. 2 : 23?

A. If the Bible be the only rule, it is either the whole Bible, including the books that are lost, or it is that portion of the Bible which we still have; if the former, then the rule is incomplete; if the latter, then let Protestants give us one text, declaring what we have to be *sufficient* as a rule, and clearly indicating the *non-necessity* of what is lost.

Q. Can you draw any argument against the Reformed rule, from the circumstance, that Christ appointed a body of pastors to teach and preach in his Church?

A. Yes; the Reformed rule makes these pastors an unnecessary lumber; for either these pastors and their people agree in their interpretation of Scripture, or they differ; if they agree, then give the people Bibles—the pastors are useless—the people can teach themselves; if they differ, then which is right—the pastor or the people? Where is the certainty? If the pastor compel the people to follow his interpretation, then their rule is destroyed; if he can not do this, then again he is useless; and if they give up their own opinion, and follow his, then they are trusting their salvation to one fallible man, who gives them, not the *infallible Word of God*, but his *fallible interpretation* of that infallible Word.

Q. If Christ intended the Bible to be man's only guide, should we not suppose that he would have written it, or ordered it to be written?

A. Certainly; and yet he never did so; he never commanded his Apostles to *write Bibles*, but to *PREACH the Gospel*.

Q. What may we ask Protestants in addition ?

A. Why did not the Apostles, who knew well the true rule of faith, write millions of Bibles, and send them to all the ends of the earth, with a command to all to learn to read them ? Why did they not establish schools, that all might be taught to read ? Why did only a few, even of the Apostles, *write* their doctrines ? Why did they allow nearly one hundred years to pass before the last book of Scripture was written ; and what rule did the Christians of that century follow, since the Scripture was *incomplete* ? Was not the world converted by the *preaching* of the Apostles and other pastors, and not by Bibles ? Why did not the Apostles even translate the Scriptures into the vulgar tongues of the nations they converted ? Why did not St. Peter and St. Paul, who lived at Rome, translate into the Roman tongue even their own Epistles ? Why did St. Paul write to the Romans in Greek—a language understood only by the learned ?

Q. Does it appear from undoubted facts, that God could never have intended the Bible to be our only rule of faith ?

A. We have seen that this was impossible during the first century, for the Bible was not completed. During the first four hundred years it was equally impossible ; few copies, and these few written with the pen, existed. Some books of Scripture were lying at one Church, and some at another ; and during these four hundred years they were translated into only one language ; yet, during these four hundred years, whilst the Bible, as a rule of faith, was a physical impossibility, *the whole world was converted* : Nay, until the art of printing was discovered, the Bible could not be the rule of faith ; and thus Protestants must maintain, that the whole world was without any rule of faith during the first fourteen hundred years of Christianity. During that time few could read, and even if they were able, they could not get a copy of the Scripture, which cost immense sums. Even at present there is not one Bible in existence for every ten souls ; and what rule are those to follow who can not read ? Thus, even during the first century, the Bible was not the only rule of faith,

and much less was it the rule during the first four, nay, during the first fourteen hundred years.

Q. If the Bible, as privately interpreted, were our only tribunal of appeal, would not God have acted like an unwise legislator, who would make every man his own judge in matters of law?

A. Yes; and is not this consideration alone sufficient to convince every reflecting person of the futility of the Protestant rule? What sort of law would we have, if every man were his own advocate as well as judge? If a wise legislator considers the judge of the law as important to the welfare of the community as the law itself, what are we to think of Protestants, who would make God give us a divine code of laws, without supplying us with divinely appointed interpreters and judges of these laws? Such a principle contains in itself endless divisions and schisms. Luther's religion, which was *one* in him, became, by the adoption of this principle, the seed of an infinity of creeds—so much so, that scarcely two Protestants have the same faith on every point.

Q. What does Capito, Protestant minister of Strasburg, admit in this matter?

A. "Our people now tell us," says he, "I know enough of the Gospel—I can read it for myself—I have no need of you." (Inter. Epist. Calv.) Dudith says to Beza: "Our people are carried away with every wind of doctrine; if you know what their religion is to-day, you can not tell what it will be to-morrow. In what single point are those who war against the Pope agreed amongst themselves?" "It is of great importance," says Calvin to Melancthon, "that the divisions which subsist among us, should not be known to future ages."

CHAP. III.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What is "the rule of faith" of the Roman Church?

A. That you are to believe just what the Church says; which means, in fact, for at least ninety-nine persons in one hundred, that they are to believe without

ever questioning or doubting at all whatever their own priests tell them.

Q. Is this the rule of belief which God has given in the Holy Scripture?

A. No; *he does not there say a word like this*, but does commend those who “search the Scriptures,” does say that these Scriptures are *all given for our instruction*, etc., and does command each one for himself to “prove all things.”

Q. But is this Roman rule of faith *reasonable*, if not scriptural?

A. No, it is very difficult or very slavish. I can not even find out with any certainty *what it means* or *what I am to do by it*. Some say that the Church speaks by a General Council; some, that it speaks by the voice of the Pope; and some, by both together. If I then decide (by my “*private judgment*,” as I must if I decide at all) which of these it is, I must read in many Greek and Latin books to find out what the Councils or Popes have said; or else I must take the word of some priest for it. In this case “THE CHURCH” means one priest or at the best two or three, or a bishop. What more security have I then for believing right than any Protestant has, who uses his free and honest judgment *upon the actual words of God*, and gets the *advice* of some wise and pious persons, especially his pastor? On the other hand, if I am told to read the word of God or hear it read with a serious and teachable spirit, I at once *understand what I am to do*, and *can do it*.

Q. What was the “rule of faith” among the first Christians?

A. To “search the Scriptures.” Their writings continually appeal to the book of God and *call upon all men* to read it and learn the truth. *They* never say, “How absurd it is that an ignorant peasant should pretend to interpret the inspired volume,” etc.

Q. Which then is the true “rule of faith”?

A. This ancient, reasonable, and scriptural one: that the Holy Bible, or book of God, contains all that he has to say to men, and that it is so plain in all the chief things of religion, that we can learn all our duty from

it. So whatever can not be proved from it need not be believed or done by Christians.

Q. Is it true that "the Protestant has only the security of his own *one* judgment; the Catholic (Romanist) has that of the *whole* Church"?

A. The latter, *according to his own rule*, has no advantage over the former. For to say nothing of the fact that he must, whether a learned man or "ignorant peasant," use "*his own one judgment*" to decide that *his is* the true and only Church, just as we use our private judgment upon the very words of God in the Scriptures; besides this, who of you (I appeal to every member of that Church who reads this) really knows what the whole Church says? Is there any fair chance given to all the members of that Church, or even to all the pastors, to discuss doctrines and give their judgment upon them? Is any one permitted to discuss them at all in most countries where that Church has the power? Therefore when you think you have "the judgment of the whole Church," are you not really resting on that of a few men? Do you then agree with the Doctrinal Catechism that this is "*all that is at present, or ever was, wise, learned, great, or good in God's Church*"?

Q. Does the true, old, and free "rule of faith" compel men in judging for themselves of the meaning of Holy Scripture to despise what the wisest and best Christians have thought, as well those of former times as of the present?

A. No; both reason and conscience command us modestly to use this and every other *help for our judgment*, but after all to use our own judgment.

Q. Does this rule make the Church and its pastors, useless, and deprive their words of all authority to the people?

A. By no means. The Church is a society established by God himself to be a "witness and keeper of holy writ," to celebrate his worship, to proclaim his Gospel, and to train his people in holiness. The pastors of the Church are the lawful officers to whom this duty is chiefly committed, and what they say *according to the Scriptures* is the audible voice of God, and as such, to be heard and respected. But above them, reproofing and correcting their mistakes when they make

them, (as they may do,) is this sure and plain *written* law, by which all men can see how faithfully the pastors do their duty and forsake them when they forsake it.

Q. Suppose it is said that then we should only have Bibles and read them at home?

A. We should indeed have Bibles and carefully read them, all of us who can. But some can not read, others will not; and even the best and wisest of us need to be *reminded* of these things by some whose special business it is to *read the Scriptures to the people in the Church*, and to speak of them to others in the name of the Lord.

Q. Is there only one true belief, and has God written that in his Scriptures?

A. Yes.

Q. Do the Reformed Churches hold this one faith?

A. Yes.

Q. How then do they differ among themselves?

A. This is only in the less plain and important matters of religion. The plain truths of Scripture by which we are saved from eternal death, they all agree in with a harmony *the more wonderful and glorious* that they are not forced or frightened into their agreement like the members of the Roman Church, but are free to say what they think.

Q. Is it not to be desired that the Universal Church should be of one mind in its belief in small things as well as great?

A. Yes; and we pray and expect that our Lord will bring this about; so that his people, *thinking freely*, and each one, "*proving all things*" *for himself*, shall see the same things in every word of his book. But he does not choose yet to make the Church perfect in this way. So also, it can not be "*without spot*" until every member of it is entirely without sin, which no one thinks to have yet come to pass, and which is yet to be looked for according to God's promise.

Q. Has this true "rule of faith" produced as many different religions as there are heads and judgments?"

A. No; for to say nothing of the fact that the ninety millions of Protestants are almost all to be counted un-

der some five or six names, and that the smaller sects are even *less numerous* than they were two hundred years ago; the general agreement of them all in *one religion*, notwithstanding their little differences, is so great, that even the Doctrinal Catechism speaks many times of "*the Protestant religion!*"*

Q. Can you give some instances of "the fact that *all Catholics* (that is, Romanists,) *of every age and country agree,*" etc., and of the delightful safety with which we may shut our own eyes and give ourselves up to the priests, so that they may save us from "the Bible, that fruitful source of delusions," etc., and lead us along in the "one true faith"?

A. Yes, here are some such instances. 1. Cardinal Bellarmine and others say the Pope by himself is infallible; the Doctrinal Catechism says "this is a Protestant invention." 2. (St.) Bernard says the immaculate conception of Mary is a blasphemous falsehood. Pope Pius IX., and most of his bishops, say it is an article of the Christian faith. 3. Alphonso de Castro, Cardinal Bellarmine, Peter Dens, (St.) Thomas Aquinas, the 4th Council of Lateran, etc., say that men ought to be punished even with death for their religious opinions; the Doctrinal Catechism admits that the doing this was a crime, (p. 292.) 4. The popes established, favored, and still continue the Inquisition; the Doctrinal Catechism confesses that this is "cruel and unwarrantable," (p. 400.) 5. "The Holy Inquisition" at Rome, says that it is *a heresy* to believe that the earth turns round and the sun stands still:† most of their pastors say that it is no heresy but a fact. 6. (Sts.) Alphonsus, Bonaventure, etc., say that Mary is omnipotent, that she commands our Lord, that she is Queen of Mercy as he is King of Justice, etc.; the Doctrinal Catechism says that to adore Mary as God would be idolatry. 7. The Council of Trent says: "The images of Christ, of the

* To be sure, it gives (or invents) on the other hand, three sentences from private letters written more than three hundred years ago, speaking of the dissensions of Protestants. I will give it this from a letter of Pope (St.) Gregory VII.: "The Romans whom I govern are worse than Saracens or Pagans." (?)

† One of the Roman Archbishops in Ireland (Cullen) has said so within the last ten years.

Virgin, the mother of God, and of the other saints, are to be had and retained, especially in churches, and due honor and veneration are to be given to them," etc. : (St.) Epiphanius says : " My children, be ye mindful that ye bring no images into the churches," etc. 8. The writings of (St.) Augustine teach *predestination* ; the Doctrinal Catechism calls this " an immoral doctrine." 9. The Roman Canon Law of the Popes contains to this day some pretended " decretals " of the first popes ; Fleury and even Baronius admit these to be *forgeries*. 10. The Council of Trent says, that " if the Holy Bible translated into the people's language be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it ; " (St.) Chrysostom says, (and all " the Fathers " say the same,) " This is the cause of all ill, *that the Scriptures are not known*. Hear me, ye men of the world ; get ye the Bible, that most wholesome remedy for the soul." Finally, there have several times been two and even three contending popes at the same time, especially from 1378 to 1417, each obeyed by a large part of the Church, and each cursing and threatening the others and all who favored them ! (See Fleury, Dupin, Platina, etc.)

Q. Is not the Holy Bible the true and perfect book of God, because Christ " did not command his Apostles to write Bibles," and because we are not told that they sent Bibles about ?

A. The Doctrinal Catechism seems to labor with such arguments as these to prove that the written word of God is a useless and foolish thing. It proves this, if it proves any thing. And so different is its doctrine in many things from that book, as we have already seen, that it is no wonder they would like to persuade men to give it up for the decrees of their Church. But we have more respect for that most holy book. When our Lord told the Apostles to " preach," that is, to *proclaim*, the Gospel, he of course meant their doing it in the holy writings as well as by speech. Part of these writings of theirs are called THE GOSPELS, and the Church always understood all the writings of the New Testament to be a part of the preaching of the Apos-

tles, and the reading of it in the Church a part of the preaching of their successors. Is it not proclaiming the message of the King of heaven to read it in the ears of others, or to give it to them to read? The Apostles did not write these things until they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and others could not read them before they were written. Yet the Doctrinal Catechism argues, that because Christians were first taught by God, speaking with the *voices* of the Holy Apostles, therefore, in after-times, they were to neglect the plain words which he had *written* by those inspired men, and only believe just what their priest told them, perhaps some savage Dominic, or infidel Cajetan, or delirious Liguori, or filthy Borgia!

Q. The Doctrinal Catechism says that it is impossible that the Bible could have been the "rule of faith" for the first four hundred years?

A. Here is what a Christian writer in the very century after the Apostles, says: "We know the plan of our salvation by no others except those by whom the Gospel came to us, which truly they *then preached*, but afterward, by the will of God, DELIVERED TO US IN THE SCRIPTURES *to be the foundation and pillar of our faith.*" ((St.) Irenæus Cont. Hær. iii. v. 1, p. 173.) They were early collected and freely read and argued from until the Dark Ages.

Q. Is it necessary in order for the Scriptures to be the rule of belief for all that every one should in fact have a copy of them and read them?

A. No; it is enough for this that there are many copies of them in free use, and that *whoever will* can get the reading of them, or hear them read, and that it is agreed by all that whatever is preached must be proved from them.

Q. Has this always been the case in the purest times and parts of the Church?

A. Yes; both in the first ages after the Apostles and in the free Reformed communions of the last three hundred years. These are all agreed (as we have shown before, see p. 94,) upon these books, and there is no reason

whatever to think that any *divine* writings are lost, as the Doctrinal Catechism pretends.

Q. Beside this law of God do we need some fellow-man to be a judge for us of what it means; and otherwise, is every man made "a judge in his own case"?

A. No; God himself is our judge by his law; but we must make our own choice whether we will honestly learn and obey this law. Otherwise, indeed, he would not judge us at all.

CHAP. IV.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Are there not many essential truths, the knowledge of which is necessary to salvation, which are not clearly laid down in Scripture?

A. Yes; many for those out of the Church, who have for their guide Scripture *alone*, as understood and explained by private interpretation. But the Scriptures having been written by inspiration by Apostles and founders of the Church, and for her use, her members are not exposed to any error or danger on this subject. The command to the Apostles and their successors was, "to teach."

Q. Even if the Scripture told us what and how many were the true, all-necessary, and original books of Scripture, would that be sufficient?

A. No; to be a certain rule of faith, it should also inform us, with the utmost certainty, what are the *true and uncorrupted copies* of the true and original Scripture. The last of the Scriptures were written nearly two thousand years ago; we know that the last chapter was added to Deuteronomy after the death of Moses, and that other changes have taken place since that time. What text, then, tells us that these changes were made by *inspired* men, and not by *impostors*? Without certainty on this head, the Bible can not be a secure rule of faith.

Q. What do you draw from the fact, that the Jews were, for generations, without the Bible as a rule of faith in their own tongue?

A. A most important inference, namely, that the

people of God were all that time without that which Protestants maintain to be the only rule of faith. That people lost the use of the *Hebrew language* in the Babylonish captivity; during fourteen generations after, they spoke *Syriac*; and the Protestants themselves admit, that there was no Syriac version of Scripture before the time of Christ, (Raycroft's Ed. of Bible, London, 1655.)

Q. Can Protestants be certain that the Jewish Rabbins did not corrupt the original Scripture?

A. No; this is another question the Bible can not answer. If these ignorant and malicious men, who hated Christianity, and in that hatred had a sufficient motive for corrupting Christianity in its source, when they inserted, after the time of Christ, points to indicate where there should be a vowel, inserted maliciously a wrong point, may they not thus have perverted verses and chapters, nay, whole books of Scripture; and what Protestant can be *now* certain that they did not do so?

Q. But even supposing all the originals which exist to be perfect, how can Protestants know that their translations from these originals are faithful?

A. Here is another necessary truth which the Bible can not teach. Translation from dead languages is at all times difficult; the original idiom of the Bible has not been in use for upwards of two thousand years; the translators are mere men, and, of course, fallible. Zuinglius says, Luther was a foul corrupter of God's word—Luther retorts the compliment upon Zuinglius; Beza condemns the translation of Œcolampadius, and Castalio condemns that of Beza; the Protestant bishop Tunstal counted two thousand errors in the first English translation; and Dr. Broughton says, the English Bible is so corrupt as to send thousands into eternal flames. The very translators themselves confess, that they are not certain that they have given the true word of God in every passage, but merely what *THEY supposed to be the best readings*. Such is the Protestant rule—such the thing to which they trust their immortal souls!

Q. If the Scripture be the only rule of faith, must it not be a matter of the last importance to know what is the true sense of that Sacred Volume ?

A. Certainly ; and yet the Scripture can not tell us this ; nay, St. Peter (2 Pet. 3 : 16) tells us, that parts of Scripture "*are hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as also the REST OF THE SCRIPTURE, to their own perdition.*" Nay, the Scripture can not even prove that itself is the word of God, and this Protestants admit. (Chillingworth, p. 69, No. 49 ; and Hooker Eccl. Polem., lib. i. s. 14, p. 86.) Dr. Covell (Defense, Art. iv. p. 31) declares : "*It is not the word of God, which does, or can assure us that we do well to think it the word of God.*" The Bible then can not tell us these two most important of all truths—that itself is the true word of God, and what is its true and genuine sense.

Q. Do you observe other necessary truths as taught by the Church, not clearly laid down in Scripture ?

A. The doctrine of the Trinity, a doctrine the knowledge of which is certainly necessary to salvation, is not explicitly and evidently laid down in Scripture, in the Protestant sense of private interpretation.

Q. What say you of infant baptism ?

A. One third part of the whole human race die before they reach their seventh year : it is then a matter of the last importance to know whether infants should be baptized ; for the Scripture declares, that baptism is necessary to salvation ; and yet the Scripture does nowhere tell us clearly whether Christ intended infants to be baptized. If it did, why should we have Baptists, who have *never been able to see this truth* clearly laid down in Scripture ? Here, then, we have a truth, upon which the salvation of one third part of the whole human race depends, which is not to be found in Scripture.

Q. Did not the Church, at the time of Christ, and before that period, keep the day of rest from five o'clock on Saturday till five on Sunday ?

A. Yes ; and yet Protestants keep it from twelve to twelve without any warrant of Scripture. Nay, they

oppose the Scripture—Levit. 23 : 32—“From *even* unto *even* shall you celebrate your Sabbath.”

Q. When Protestants do profane work upon Saturday, or the seventh day of the week, do they follow the Scripture as their only rule of faith—do they find this permission clearly laid down in the Sacred Volume?

A. On the contrary, they have only the authority of tradition for this practice. In profaning Saturday, they violate one of God’s commandments, which he has never clearly abrogated : “Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath day.”

Q. Is the observance of Sunday, as the day of rest, a matter clearly laid down in Scripture?

A. It certainly is not ; and yet all Protestants consider the observance of this particular day as essentially necessary to salvation. To say, we observe the Sunday because Christ rose from the dead on that day, is to say we act without warrant of Scripture ; and we might as well say, that we should rest on Thursday because Christ ascended to heaven on that day, and rested in reality from the work of redemption.

Q. Is it not said, in the Book of Revelations, that St. John was in the spirit on the Lord’s day, that is, Sunday ; and is not this Scriptural proof that Sunday is the day to be observed in the New Law?

A. Are we then to observe this particular day, merely because St. John had a revelation upon it ; must we observe, as a day of rest and holiness, any day upon which *an Apostle was in the spirit*?

Q. But it is called the Lord’s day?

A. And is not every day the Lord’s day ; does this text tell you not to work upon that day ; does it tell you that the obligation of keeping Saturday is done away with, or that it was not the day of the Resurrection or Ascension which St. John here calls the Lord’s day?

Q. Is it not said in the Acts, “And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow,” and is not this sufficient Scriptural authority for the observance of the first day of the week?

A. But does this text abrogate the observance of Saturday the seventh day, or allow Protestants to do profane work on that day? Certainly not. They should

then rest upon both days, if they hold the above text as any argument. The text in question does not say that the Apostle preached, or that the people assembled every first day of the week, but merely on this particular day, for which a good reason is given, namely, that St. Paul was to depart next day. It is quite clear, however, that they met every Saturday; for the same Acts say, St. Paul preached in the synagogue every Sabbath, and exhorted the Jews and the Greeks. Besides, it is not wonderful that the disciples came together on this first day of the week, since, according to Acts 2, they continued DAILY in the Temple breaking bread.

Q. Does not St. Paul order the Galatians and Corinthians to make collections on the first day of the week?

A. Yes; but, again, this does not abolish the observance of Saturday. St. Paul does not say that the people would be at church on that day; that they were to keep that day, to the exclusion of Saturday holy; or that these collections were to be made at church, but merely that every man should lay up by himself in store upon that day.

Q. What do you conclude from all this?

A. That Protestants have no Scripture for the measure of their day of rest; that they abolish the observance of Saturday without warrant of Scripture; that they substitute Sunday in its place without Scriptural authority, consequently, that for all this, they have only traditional authority. Yet Protestants would look upon a man who would do profane work after five o'clock on Sunday, or keep the Saturday and profane the first day, as a victim of perdition. Hence we must conclude, that the Scripture, which does not teach these things clearly, does not contain all necessary truths, and, consequently, can not be the only rule of faith.

Q. Does it not appear from all this, that Protestants teach, in many things, what is opposed to Scripture, and that the Catholic doctrines are much more Scriptural?

A. This is very evident from all we have said, and must be considered indisputable, if we study carefully what has been said in page 88, and the following.

CHAP. IV.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What does this whole chapter of the Doctrinal Catechism seem to be?

A. An attempt to make men despise and neglect the Holy Scriptures. All you who truly believe in Jesus our Lord ought to reflect whether this is not properly the work of the Atheists and Satan. It would seem as if some writers were not sorry to make men infidels if they could only keep them from being Protestants.

Q. Have we good proof that the Holy Scriptures have by the care of God come down to us from the men who wrote them as they were inspired by Him, in such an uncorrupted way that we can heartily trust them, just as though he directly gave them to us now?

A. Yes, as we have shown before (see p. 93,) and as has been more fully shown in the excellent "Evidences of Christianity" of Dr. Paley and other like works.

Q. Is it true that the Jews, while they were the people of God, were without Scripture for fourteen generations?

A. No; it is utterly untrue. We have no reason to think that there ever was a time when they could not all understand the Hebrew Scriptures. In our Lord's time it was always read in the synagogues on the Sabbath days. (Luke 4 : 16 ; Acts 15 : 21.) He himself said to the young man who asked about his duty, "How *readest* thou?" (Luke 10 : 26.)

Q. Can we trust our English Bible to be fairly translated?

A. With entire safety for all important matters. So plain a book has God written, that even the English translation which the Roman Church had made to suit itself, is so much against it, that it discourages its people from reading even that. As for the true English Bible we may pass by what is said of it by "Dr. Broughton," a man crazy with wounded self-conceit, and "*the Protestant bishop, Tonstal,*" who was a *Roman* bishop, and a fierce persecutor of Protestants! we may pass these by when we have the unanimous voice of *all the great English scholars* in its favor. Take as a specimen of this, these words of the very learned Dr. John Taylor of Norwich: "As our English translation is in it-

self *by far the most excellent book in our language*, so it is a pure and plentiful fountain of divine knowledge, giving a TRUE, FULL, and CLEAR account of the divine dispensations and of the Gospel of our salvation, insomuch that whoever studies the Bible, the ENGLISH BIBLE, is sure of gaining that knowledge and faith which, if duly applied to the heart and conversation, WILL INFALLIBLY GUIDE HIM TO ETERNAL LIFE."

Q. Do we pretend that we can learn from the Scriptures themselves alone that they are the word of God, etc.?

A. No; we leave to the Roman Church such reasoning as this, (see p. 97,) "We receive the Scriptures because the Church tells us to; and we do what the Church tells us to because we receive the Scriptures, etc., etc."

We receive the Scriptures as from God, by that *true* tradition of their being handed down to us in the plainest manner from the men who showed themselves to have come from God by the *miracles* they did. And we find those Scriptures agreeing to this by an excellence in them far above what men of themselves could have written.

Q. Is it a just objection to the word of God, that "it can not tell us what is its true and genuine sense"?

A. Plain and honest words tell their own "true and genuine sense." It is mere nonsense to complain because God does not say after the commandment, *Thou shalt not steal*, "This means, *Thou shalt not steal*."

Q. What do you say to the remark of the Doctrinal Catechism upon the doctrine of the Trinity?

A. It is an insult to the Lord to say that this doctrine, so far as it is necessary to salvation, is not plainly contained in the Scriptures.

Q. What of the baptism of infants?

A. We have already seen (see p. 233) that we do found our practice of this upon the Scripture.*

* It is a fair specimen of the kind of arguments to which the defenders of the Roman Church are forced to resort, that the Doctrinal Catechism asks with an air of triumph: "Why," if the Scriptures are in our favor, "should we have Baptists who have *never been able to see this truth* clearly laid down in Scripture?" On the other hand, it claims on p. 198, that "there is not one truth more clearly established

Q. What of its argument about keeping the Lord's Day holy ?

A. We find this duty in one of the Ten Commandments of God, which orders us to keep *one day in seven* holy. In the law of Moses this was the last or seventh day of the week, (Saturday.) But the Church of Christ changed the holy day from the last to the first day of the week in honor of our Lord's Resurrection on that day, and called it the Lord's Day. Thus the Church never presumed to repeal that great law of God which commanded men to devote one day in seven to worship and other religion ; it only (under the authority of the Holy Apostles) appointed *one* day of the week for this rather than *another*.

Q. Is this the belief of the Roman Church ?

A. We should hope so ; for that Church is far enough gone away from the truth of God in other things without erring in this also. Yet to judge from this argument of the Doctrinal Catechism (as well as other writings and common practice among its members) it would seem to teach otherwise ; namely, that the fourth commandment meant *strictly the last day of the week, Saturday*. Clearly then, as the Roman Church does not pretend to keep that day holy, by the argument of the Doctrinal Catechism, "*in profaning Saturday, they violate one of God's commandments which he has never clearly abrogated*" ! Are these indeed the faithful people of God ?—yes, (as they claim)—THE ONLY CHRISTIANS ?

CHAP. V.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Does it appear from Scripture, that the written word was ever, either under the Old or the New Law, considered as the only rule of faith ?

A. Until the time of Moses there was no written revelation ; yet Seth, Abraham, Isaac, Melchizedek,

in Scripture than the supremacy of Peter." Yet it would think us very weak in argument if our only answer to this claim was to say, "Why then should we have so many Protestants who have never been able to see this truth clearly laid down in Scripture?"

and all God's people, were saved by the belief of truths for which they could have no authority but tradition.

Q. What says Moses as to the Book of the Law which he wrote, and which was the first written revelation the world was favored with?

A. He orders the Levites to deposit it "in the side of the Ark of the covenant of the Lord;" adding, "after *seven years*, in the year of remission, . . . thou shalt read the words of this law before all Israel in their hearing." (Deut. 31 : 24, *et seq.*) Was this a giving of the written word to the people as their only rule? The Levites are ordered to read it to the people, and this only once in the seven years.

Q. What do we find in Deut. chap. 17 : 8, 9, *et seq.*?

A. God commands his people, whenever they find among them a hard and doubtful matter in judgment, "to come to the priests of the Levitical race, and to the judge that shall be at that time, (the High Priest,) and thou shalt ask of them," says the Lord, "and they shall show thee the truth of the judgment; and thou shalt do whatsoever they shall say, . . . and what they shall teach thee; and he that will be proud, and refuse to obey the commandment of the priest who ministereth at that time, . . . that man shall die." Moses had written out the law by this time; yet he, the inspired oracle of heaven, does not put that written word into the hands of the people, that by it they might decide their disputes; on the contrary, he orders them, under pain of death, to have recourse to the priests of the Church, and especially to the High Priest. See 2 Paralip. (2 Chron. 19) and Malachias 2 : 7, where it is said: "The lips of the priest shall keep knowledge, and the people shall seek the law at his mouth."

Q. Is not the New Testament equally clear on this head?

A. Certainly; for Christ never wrote any thing, and never commanded his Apostles to write. In Heb. 1 : 2, it is said, "In these days (God) hath spoken" (not written) "to us, by his Son." In Matt. 28 : 18, Christ does not say to his Apostles, Go, write Bibles to all nations, but, "Go, *teach* all nations." In Luke 10 : 16, He does not say, he that readeth, or heareth the Scrip-

ture, heareth me, but, "He that *heareth* you, heareth me." In Matt. 18 : 17, he does not say, he that will not read the Scripture, but, "He that will not *HEAR the Church*, is to be considered as a heathen and publican."

CHAP. V.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. Because in the early ages of the world, God spoke to men only by prophets, but they had no written word of God, shall *we* not use this Scripture when he has given it to us in place of his spoken word?

A. That would be most foolish and ungrateful.

Q. Must Christians give up the Holy Scriptures and believe every thing their pastors tell them, because under the law of Moses the Levites were to read the Old Scriptures to the Jews once in seven years?

A. No; for first, this is not the law for Christians; and, secondly, it was never even the law for the Jews that they should take their knowledge of what God said at second-hand from their priests. This law was to be *all read to all, at least*, once in seven years. But it was to be privately studied and learned by all, young and old, and even the very words learned by heart, as is the custom of the Jews to this day. (See Deut. 6 : 6-9, etc.) They would smile if they were told that it had ever been the rule of their people to leave the Scriptures to their priests and learn the word of God only from their mouths.

Q. But the Doctrinal Catechism argues that you should get all your religious belief from the Roman priests, because in the law of the Jews, they were "whenever they found a hard and doubtful matter in judgment to come to the priests," etc.?

A. Yes; and, my reader, you shall see by the whole passage that this is worthy by its unfairness and folly, to be placed by the side of its other argument from the words, "Hear the Church." "If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment, *between blood and blood, between plea and plea, and between stroke and stroke*, being matters of controversy within thy gates; then shalt thou arise and get thee up into the place which

the Lord thy God shall choose. And thou shalt come unto the priests, the Levites, and with the judge that shall be in those days and inquire, and they shall show thee *the sentence of judgment*. And thou shalt do according to the sentence which they of that place which the Lord shall choose shall show thee." (Deut. 17: 8-10.) You see that this is only about private disputes between men, such as are now settled by law-suits, or by leaving them out to umpires. Yet this is brought to prove that now when a Roman priest teaches something different from what God says in his plain book, I am to believe that the book means what the man says!

Q. Is not the minister of Christ to teach the word of God with all authority?

A. Yes, truly; but while he teaches, the free and plainly-written word stands before him and the people. From it he draws his lessons, and to it he appeals for their truth. If he preach any other gospel than is in them, as St. Paul says, "Let him be accursed." And he who reads or hears these Scriptures, *does* hear the Lord and his Apostles even more than in the preaching of pastors.

CHAP. VI.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Do Catholics depend on traditional doctrines as well as on those that are Scriptural or written?

A. Yes; we believe that what Christ or his Apostles *spoke*, is as true as what they *wrote*. It is clear, from what we have seen above, that they delivered many truths by word of mouth which are not written in the Scripture. These truths are considered authentic and divine by Catholics, when it is found that they have been believed by all Christian nations, and in every age of the Church.

Q. Does the Scripture authorize this dependence on traditional doctrine?

A. In 2 Thess. 2: 15, we have: "Hold the *traditions* you have been taught, whether by *word*, or by our

Epistle." In 2 Corinth. 3 : 3, it is said : " You are the Epistle of Christ, *not written with ink*, but with the Spirit of the living God." Here, what is not *written* is called the *Epistle* of Christ, written with the Spirit of the living God upon the heart, which, though only tradition, most certainly must be as true as the written word itself.

Q. Have you any other texts to the same effect ?

A. 2 Thess. 3 : 6 : " Withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the *tradition* which ye have received of us." See Rom. 6 : 17 ; 1 Cor. 11 : 2 ; Tim. 6 : 20 : Tim. 1 : 13, where it is said : " Hold fast the form of *sound words* which thou hast *heard* of me." 1 Thess. 2 : 13 : " When ye received the *word of God*, which ye *heard* of us, ye received it, not as the word of men, but (as it is in truth) the *word of God*."

Q. How can you distinguish true from false tradition ?

A. As easily as you can distinguish a true from a false copy of Scripture. In both cases you must depend on the uniform and universal testimony of Christian antiquity. You hold your Bible to be the word of God, because all Christian ages and nations have done so before you ; and you have the very same testimony for the traditional doctrines held as divine by the Catholic Church. We have as much evidence for the truth of universally-admitted traditional doctrine, as we have for the truth and authenticity and divinity of the four Gospels.

Q. Does not our Saviour say, " Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life" ? John 5 : 39.

A. Yes ; but he does not say, in them ye *have certainly* eternal life. This argument would prove, that the *Old Testament*, without the *New*, was sufficient ; for, at this time, not *one word of the New Testament was written*. In 2 Tim. 3 : 15, we are told, that all Scripture is profitable, and that it maketh wise unto salvation ; and what Catholic ever denied this ? This text does not say that the Scripture *alone* maketh wise as to every thing necessary. The book of Genesis makes men wise, but will this one book make men wise

in every religious truth? St. Paul praises Timothy, because he had read the Scriptures from his youth; but then Timothy was a bishop, whose duty it was, not only to read, but to expound the Scripture.

Q. What say you to Deut. 4 : 2 : "You shall not add to the word which I speak, nor take away from it?"

A. At this time nothing but the Mosaic law was written; hence, this passage in the mouth of a Protestant proves, that he believes the Mosaic law sufficient as a rule of faith. But what will he say to the Prophets and Apostles, who afterwards added all the rest of the Old and New Testament? It is not what is added by inspired men that is here condemned, but what is *contrary* to that which God had already revealed, for God does not condemn the good institutions of men. 2 Chron. 30 : 21, after the children of Israel, according to law, had kept the solemnity of Azymes seven days, (ver. 23,) the whole assembly took good counsel to keep other seven days, and yet, though this was a human addition, (ver. 27,) "their prayer came to the holy habitation of heaven." Thus also, Christ himself (John 10 : 22) keeps the feast of the dedication, mentioned in 1st Macchabees, 4 : 56, though this book is not admitted by Protestants to be Scripture at all.

Q. Does not St. John, at the end of Apocalypse, the last book of Scripture, say: "If any man shall add to these things, God shall add unto him the plagues written in this book?" (Chap. 22 : 18.)

A. The Apocalypse, though *placed* last in order, was not last *written*. St. John wrote his Gospel some years after his liberation from the Isle of Patmos, where the Apocalypse was composed; hence, as St. John, according to the Protestant sense of the words above quoted, would himself incur the curse, it is evident that he merely threatens with that curse any one who should dare to vitiate, by addition or subtraction, the book which he there concludes, that is, the book of the Apocalypse. He ends his Gospel by declaring (John 20 : 25) that our Lord did much that was not written; and surely the witnesses of these doings were not accursed for relating and believing what they had seen, or heard from the lips of Christ, although these things were

never written. The Thessalonians had tradition, (2 Thess. 2 14 ;) Timothy had a form of *sound words*, (2 Tim. 1 : 13 ;) and were they, or are we, to be visited by the plagues, because in obedience to St. Paul, we hold these traditions, in addition to what God commanded to be written? It is therefore a mere Protestant gloss, unauthorized by the text itself, and in contradiction to the rest of the Scripture, to assert, that we are to believe nothing except what is written.

CHAP. VI.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What does "tradition" mean?

A. The delivering and handing, or passing down of any thing from age to age.

Q. What, then, are the "traditions" of true religion as we have them, and as the Apostles speak of them in their writings?

A. 1st. Their preaching in those times. 2d. Their holy writings, in which the substance of that preaching is written as they were moved and guided by God ; so that they there said all that was necessary for us to know and nothing but what was true and important. These writings (or Scriptures) have passed down through all the ages and come to us. 3d. The general understanding in those first times of the meaning of these Holy Scriptures by which if any serious questions arise, we may better learn what is their fair meaning. 4th. The government and ceremonies of worship which were first used in the Church, and which have passed down with more or less change to our times.

Q. What of the first of these?

A. Of course we have nothing to do with this, as we do not hear the Apostles preach.

Q. What of the second?

A. By this we have a full account of what God has spoken to men by his Son and by the holy Apostles and Prophets.

Q. What of the third?

A. When any persons endeavor to fix a new meaning upon the words of Holy Scripture, it is a reasonable way of finding the true sense to inquire, with fairness, how the first Christians understood it. Thus if some say that the Scriptures tell us that in the sacrament of the Holy Communion, the bread and wine become the very corporal flesh and blood of our Lord, with his soul and divinity, and that we ought to kneel and bow down before them and adore them as such; it throws great light on this question and decides it, to find out that the first Christians had no such notion, and never adored the bread and wine. (See p. 287.) Thus this tradition helps to expose the false meanings which some torture out of the Scriptures.

Q. What of the fourth kind of tradition?

A. This also is a guide to the Church in determining the best forms of its government, public worship, etc. Yet as all these things are left by the Lord much to the judgment of the Church itself according to the various exigencies of times and occasions, these traditions are rather *suggestions* to it than binding laws.

Q. But is there not another sort of tradition yet, by which things we are as much bound to believe and to do as what is written in the Scripture, have passed down to us from the Apostles, transmitted from one generation to another, only *by word of mouth*?

A. No, *positively*. It is a delusion to believe so. Attend now, I beg of you, and I will show why all doctrine ought to be and was "*written for our learning*," (Rom. 15 : 4,) and so delivered to the generations after the Apostles.

All men know how subject to be changed in passing from one mouth to another, that is which is only spoken. So all *laws* are written down, and even, in this country, most important *agreements between men* must be *put in writing*, or they can not be enforced by law. If one man had bought of another a piece of ground, he might bring twenty other men to prove the bargain, yet it would not be allowed by any court unless he could show a *written deed* of it. This is because, as I have said before, what is only *spoken* is so easily mistaken

and misstated; just as all reports and rumors are magnified and changed in passing from one person to another. How much more danger of this kind would there be in delivering the words of God to all the men in the world, and passing them down through a hundred generations. But if any one replies that it is "the Church" which repeats these traditions; and that the Lord is so with the Church that it can make no mistake; then (to say nothing of our having already seen that there is *no proof* that the Church can not err, but *the plainest proof* that it actually *has* erred,) why was not all doctrine committed to the Church in this safe *spoken tradition*? why HAVE ANY of it *written*? why have any *Scripture* at all? ANSWER THAT. No, my fellow-Christian, Holy Scripture was given to you, as St. Luke says, "That thou mightest know the certainty of those things in which thou hast been instructed," (1 : 4,) and as St. John says: "These are *written* that ye might believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and that believing, ye might have life through his name." (20 : 31.)

Q. We have the Scriptures in a well-known book; but if there were any such "unwritten Word of God" by tradition, where should I go to find it?

A. Those who claim to possess it are the very ones who believe in those monstrous departures from the Scriptures and the practice of the first Christians, such as image-worship, purgatory, prayers in an unknown tongue, etc., etc. Yes, it is of such things that they say, "These TRUTHS are considered *authentic* and *divine*," "when it is found that they have been believed by *all Christian nations* and IN EVERY AGE OF THE CHURCH"! That is enough of itself and shows the evil of this false tradition.*

* We have here another instance of the reasoning from Scripture common in the Roman Church. The Doctrinal Catechism says: "St. Paul praises Timothy because he had read the Scriptures from his youth; but then Timothy was a bishop," etc. *As if he had been a bishop "FROM A CHILD,"* for those are the words of St. Paul. We may also remark that it is the judgment of the wisest scholars that the Apocalypse, or Revelation, was written by St. John in the very last years of his life.

*On the True Rule of Faith, or the Infallibility of the
True Church of Christ.*

CHAP I.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. What is the rule of faith adopted by Catholics?

A. All truly inspired Scripture, and all truly divine tradition, interpreted by the teaching body of the Church—that is, by the Pastors to whom Christ said: “Go, *teach* all nations.” This teaching body, when taken collectively with the chief Pastor at their head, all Catholics believe to be infallible—that is, that they can not teach any error against faith or morals. Now, if this great fundamental truth be clearly laid down in Scripture, then Catholics will be quite safe in following the teaching of their Pastors—then the *teaching* body will be, to the *taught*, an infallible rule of faith. Mark well, we do not maintain that the pastors of the Church are, of themselves, infallible, but that God has made them so for the benefit of his people, and that Christ himself teaches by their lips.

Q. What proof have you to advance for all this?

A. In Isaiah 2 : 3, Christ is represented as teaching the Church—“He will teach us his ways, and we shall walk in his paths.”* That Church must be infallible in its teaching, which has Christ as its director, and whose children walk in the paths of the Saviour.

Q. What do we find in Isaiah 54 : 17?

A. That no weapon which is formed against the Church of Christ shall prosper; and that every tongue which resisteth her in judgment she shall condemn. Surely she must be infallible, if she triumph over every enemy, and have power from God to condemn every

* Our Protestant brethren have only to refer to their own Bible, and note the titles of its chapters, to be satisfied, that this and the following passages, quoted from the Old Testament, have a direct reference to the Church of Christ, whose infallibility they foretell in the most explicit terms.

tongue that opposes her decisions. In Isaiah 60 : 12, it is said, "that the nation and kingdom that will not serve her shall perish." Now, could nations be compelled to serve the Church, if she could lead them astray and teach them error?

Q. Do we find any thing of importance to our purpose in Ezekiel 44 : 23?

A. "They (the priests) shall teach my people what is between a holy thing and a thing polluted, and the difference between clean and unclean they shall show them; and when there shall be a controversy, they shall stand in judgment, and shall judge according to my judgments." The judgments of the priests of the Most High must then be infallible, since they are according to the judgment of God himself.

Q. What have we in Psalm 132 : 13?

A. We have—"Our Lord hath chosen Sion; he hath chosen it for an habitation to himself; this is my rest forever and ever; here will I dwell, because I have chosen it." Now, according to St. Paul, 1 Tim. 3 : 15, Christ's dwelling-place is his Church—"that thou mayest know how to converse in the *house of God*, the *Church of the living God*." It must be manifest, then, that the Church of Christ is pure and free from error; for, were she the mother and mistress of idolatry, the pure God of heaven could never have chosen her for his dwelling-place.

Q. What says Isaiah 54 : 4?

A. "Fear not," says the Almighty, addressing the Church, "for thou shalt not be ashamed, neither be thou confounded, for thou shalt not be put to shame." If, as Protestants pretend, the Church became idolatrous, surely she must have been put to shame, and, in this case, the words of the Almighty are supposed false, which is evident blasphemy.

Q. Is there not a still more brilliant testimony to the infallibility of the Christian Church in the same Prophet, 60 : 15?

A. Yes; "I will make thee an **ETERNAL** excellence." Would the Church be an *eternal excellence*, if after a few centuries' duration, she had fallen into the depths

of idolatry? And, in verse 18, "Thou shalt call thy walls *salvation*; our Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light; thy sun shall go down no more, and thy moon shall be no more diminished." Now, could it be said of an idolatrous Church, that her walls were salvation—that the infallible Deity was her *everlasting light*—that her sun should set no more, nor her moon withdraw her light? According to these texts, either the Church is perpetual, pure, and infallible, or God is a false prophet. In chap. 42 : 3, she is called "*a crown of glory, the delight of the Almighty*;" and in ver. 12, she is called, "*a city sought for and not forsaken*;" and could she be either the one or the other, if she had, as Protestants pretend, fallen into idolatry and superstition?

Q. What says Ezech. 34 : 22 ?

A. "I will save my flock, and it will be no more a spoil." Could the flock be saved from spoil, if the Church teaching that flock were full of error and buried in idolatry, as Protestants contend, for upwards of a thousand years? Surely that Church is infallible in which God himself saves the flock from spoil.

Q. Is not this infallibility clearly laid down in Isaiah 61 : 8 ?

A. Yes, very clearly. "I will direct their work in *truth*," says the Lord of his Christian Pastors, "and I will make an *everlasting covenant* with them" for preserving this *never-failing truth*. Surely nothing could more explicitly point out the infallibility of the future Christian Church. Again, 35 : 5, it is said, that in the time of Christ's Church, "the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and a highway shall be there, and it shall be called the way of holiness, . . . though fools shall not err therein." Now, if the Church were idolatrous or superstitious, could she be called a way of holiness, a way in which even fools could not err?

Q. Do we not find a very strong text in Isaiah 69 : 20 ?

A. Yes, there the Almighty makes a covenant with his Church, which places her infallibility beyond all doubt. "There shall come," says he, "a Redeemer to Sion, and to them that shall return from iniquity in

Jacob ; as for me, this is my covenant with them : my spirit that is in thee, and my words that I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seeds' seed, from henceforth and forever." Surely a Church, with the Word of God in her mouth, with the Spirit of God as her guide, and having the word of heaven, that these shall remain with her *forever*, must be infallible—can teach no error.

Q. What say you to the words of Jeremiah 32 : 39, where God says of his Christian Church : "I will give them one heart and one way, that they may fear me forever ; I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me?"

A. Protestants see here how false is their assertion, that after three or four hundred years' duration, the Church of Christ fell into idolatry. That Church is to *fear God forever*, and never to depart from God. In Ezec. 37 : 24, the Almighty says : "They shall walk in my judgments, and *observe my statutes and do them*. I will make a *covenant of peace unto them* ; it shall be an *everlasting covenant* with them ; I will set *my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore*." We here ask any reasoning Protestant, if an idolatrous Church can observe God's statutes ; can He make an everlasting peace with such a Church ; or can it be even imagined, that He could place his holy sanctuary in the midst of a mass of idolatry and superstition *for evermore*.

On the True Rule of Faith, or the Infallibility of the True Church of Christ.

CHAP. I.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What is plain of all the texts quoted here by the Doctrinal Catechism ?

A. They *foretell* the glory of the Church. Therefore it is not necessary that they *should have been* fulfilled *from the beginning* of the Church ; but only that they *shall* be so in the course of its history. A clear instance

of this is in the first passage quoted, Isaiah 2 : 3, "He will teach us his ways," etc. ; immediately after which it says, that "they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." (Verse 4.) No one will pretend that *this* has already come to pass.

Q. If, then, we know that this prophecy of universal peace is *yet to be* fulfilled, since there is still war in the world—what shall we conclude of such prophecies as that "Our Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light: thy sun shall go down no more, and thy moon shall be no more diminished"—when we find that the Church has been in fact very corrupt, and is still imperfect?

A. That *these* prophecies are also *yet to be* fulfilled.

Q. But suppose some one argues, that what you see to be facts *can not be facts*, because God has said, "Our Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light," etc., and "Fear not, for thou shalt not be ashamed," etc.—that therefore if the Church has erred, "in this case the words of the Almighty are supposed false, which is evident blasphemy"?

A. The very question is: What does God say in these prophecies? WE say that he evidently foretells that the Church shall not only never utterly perish, but also in the course of time, triumph in all the world with the glory of holiness, and finally flourish forever in heaven. We say that plainly, this does not mean that the Church should never fall into general error, since in fact it has done so, as we have already shown by comparing its belief and practice in the Dark Ages with the pure Word of God. To deny this in the face of common-sense and plain history, is as foolish as it would be to argue, that because these prophecies say to the Church, "Fear not, for thou shalt not be ashamed," etc.—therefore all the people and all the pastors have always been holy persons. Now, *Cardinal Baronius* says (An. 912 :) "What was then the face of the Holy Roman Church? How exceeding foul was it, when most powerful and sordid and abandoned women *ruled at Rome*, at whose will the sees were changed, bishops were presented, and what is horrid to hear, and unutterable, *false pontiffs*, their lovers, were intruded *into the chair of Peter*, who were only written in the cata-

logue of Roman pontiffs for the sake of marking the time. For who can affirm that men illegally intruded by wicked women of this sort, were Roman pontiffs? There was never any mention of the clergy electing or afterward approving. All the canons were closed in silence. The decrees of the Pontiffs were suppressed, the ancient traditions were proscribed, and the ancient customs in electing the pope, and the sacred ceremonies and usages of former days were *wholly extinct*. Thus lust, relying upon the secular power, and mad and stimulated with the rage of dominion, claimed every thing for itself. Then, as it seems, *Christ evidently was in a deep sleep in the ship*, when these winds, blowing so strongly, the ship itself was covered with the waves." So also, Genebrard, a monk, says, (Chron. An. 904:) "For nearly one hundred and fifty years, about *fifty Popes*, namely, from John VIII., who succeeded the Holy Pope Nicholas and Adrian II., to Leo IX., (who, called by God as another Aaron, first brought back from heaven the ancient integrity of the Popes, to the apostolic see,) deserted wholly the virtue of their predecessors, being *apostate* rather than *apostolical*. Of so many Popes, five only are even slightly praised." Was it said to the Church of such days, "Fear not, for *thou shalt not be ashamed*, neither be thou confounded, for thou shalt not be put to shame?"

Q. Show further by some one passage of those quoted by the Doctrinal Catechism, that the Roman Church can not be the perfect and glorious Church here foretold?

A. This is one: "The nation and kingdom that will not serve her shall perish." (See page 484.) Three hundred years ago England parted from that Church, while Spain remained *most steadfast to it*. *Then Spain was the mightiest country of Europe*, far more so than England. How is it now? Has the former, which "would not serve" the Roman Church, "perished?" Has not the latter, which chose to serve it most slavishly, all but perished, and once or twice only been saved from utter destruction by this very England? What has thus debased it? and what now alone gives a little life and hope to it? We think we know.

CHAP. II.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Arguments from the New Testament.

Q What do you observe on Matt. 18 : 17—"If he will not hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen and a publican?"

A. We ask, could a good God, who came to teach truth, and to save men by the belief of truth, give such a command as this, if the Church, which he appointed to teach, were an idolatrous Church? Suppose, for a moment, that Church teaching even one error, does not Christ, in the above text, command all to believe that error under pain of being as heathens and publicans, for whom there is no salvation? If this supposition be not blasphemous, I know not what is; and yet such is the language of every Protestant. By rejecting the infallibility of the teaching body of the Church, they evidently make the Saviour command his people to believe idolatry, as the Church, according to them, fell into it, and taught it soon after Christ left the world.

Q. Have you any remark to make on the next verse—Matt. 18 : 18—where Christ says to the teachers in his Church, "Whatsoever you shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven?"

A. Yes; these words have relation to the Sacrament of Penance, and the other doctrines connected with it. But the infallibility of the Church is secured and asserted in other parts of the Scripture, as, "Go ye, teach;" "I am with you all days;" "He that hears you, hears me."

Q. Do you here suppose the teachers individually infallible, or that they are free personally from all sin and error?

A. By no means; philosophically speaking, if all the bishops of the Church, scattered over all the nations of the earth, all men of learning and probity, who have never seen one another—who have had no means of combining to teach any particular doctrine—and who have had no motive for such, do actually teach the very same truths, then we maintain, by all laws of human evidence or moral certainty, that their combined testimony to the existence of any doctrine infallibly proves its truth. This, however, is not what we contend for here; we

maintain our teaching body to be infallible, because God has made them so ; as in the Old Law he made the Scribes and Pharisees, who were the public ministers of his Church, (though often, no doubt, personally sinners,) infallible, for the safety of those whom they taught. That these teachers of the ancient Church were infallible, is more than evident from Matt. 23 : 1 : "Upon the chair of Moses have sitten the Scribes and Pharisees ; *all therefore whatsoever* they shall say unto you, *observe and do.*" Were they not *infallible teachers*, even God could not thus command us to *obey* them ; and surely no one will make the teachers of the better Christian Church inferior to these.

Q. Did not the Apostles and first Christians act on this teaching as infallible ?

A. Yes ; in Acts 15 : 2, Paul and Barnabas, and certain others, went up to Jerusalem to have a disputed question of religion authoritatively decided. They had no Scripture to guide them ; yet, after *great disputation*, they as the teaching body, determined the point, declaring that their decision was the decision of the Holy Ghost—"It seemeth good to the Holy Ghost and to us ;" and this decision was obeyed by all, as the infallible decree of heaven.

Q. Is it not manifest, from Gal. 2 : 1, that the first Christians reposed no confidence in any authority but the Church teaching ?

A. It is ; even St. Paul, after teaching and preaching fourteen years, goes up to Jerusalem. "I went up," says he, "according to revelation, and conferred with them the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles." St. Paul does not take the Scripture here as his only rule ; no, no ; he draws an additional confirmation of his own inspired teaching, from its conformity to the teachings of the Church, necessarily infallible. This, however, not as if he were doubtful, but to satisfy such, if any, as might regard him as a teacher apart or distinct from the Church.

Q. Does not St. Paul—Ephes. 4 : 11—supply us with a very strong argument : "He gave some Apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, until we all meet in the unity of faith" ?

A. This certainly is a strong passage. Here the Bible is not employed to perfect the saints—to edify the body of Christ—but a body of living teachers are pointed out, and these must be infallible in their doctrine, otherwise they would neither *perfect* nor edify the body of Christ.

Q. What say you on Matt. 16 : 18—"The gates of hell shall not prevail against it," (the Church) ?

A. In this passage, Christ is the architect or builder—"On this rock *I will build my Church.*" A rock is the foundation ; and Christ declares, that even all the power of hell shall never prevail against her. Who, then, will dare to assert, that this Church, with such a foundation, such an architect, and such a promise, is fallible—that she may fall into idolatry ? Either she can not fail, or Christ is only a false and impotent prophet.

Q. Is not the infallibility of the Church clearly pointed out in Matt. 28 : 18, 19, 20, where it is said, "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth ; going therefore, teach all nations, . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you ; and behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the worlds" ?

A. Christ here sends his Pastors to teach *all nations*, and to teach them until the end of the world : He knew well that his Apostles could not do this of themselves ; for twelve mortal men could not teach *every where* and *always* until the consummation of the world. When, therefore, Christ sent these first teachers, he sent with them all their chosen assistants and successors ; for surely Christ did not come merely to secure safe teachers to those who lived in the time of the Apostles ! Now, he says he has all power ; therefore he *can* make his *teachers infallible* : He, the God of truth, sends them to *teach* all nations ; and surely he does not send them to *teach error* ! *He will be with them*, he says, *all days*, and, beyond all doubt, he will be with them, to preserve them at all times from teaching even the smallest error, for he could not be with an idolatrous Church. Hence, as *Christ himself* is the *guide* of the Church, and this *in every age*, she can obviously teach no error ; hence she is infallible.

Q. What says St. Paul—1 Tim. 3 : 15?

A. He calls the visible Church, in which Timothy is a teacher, "THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF TRUTH." What man will dare attempt to give these clear words even two probable explanations? She is, says an Apostle, the *Church of the living God*, therefore she can teach no error. She is *the pillar and ground of truth*; could she be so, if she taught idolatry or superstition?

Q. We admit, you may say, that the Church was infallible until the Scripture was written, but after that period the Scripture became the infallible rule.

A. Christ does not tell you that his Church will be infallible only for a time—he declares she will be so until the end of time; nor does St. Paul say, that the Church will *ever cease* to be the pillar and ground of truth. The Scriptures are, beyond doubt, an infallible rule to the extent of the revealed truth contained in them, but they are infallible *only* in themselves and not with regard to us, unless we are prepared to say, that the meaning we give them is infallibly correct, and that this can not be, we have only to consider how Protestants contradict one another in interpreting Scripture. The Bible, then, can not be an infallible rule, unless your understanding of it be infallibly right; but of this you can never be certain, unless you have it interpreted for you by an infallible judge, and this, as you must see, supposes the existence of an infallible Church?

Q. In Luke 10 : 16, what do we find?

A. "He that heareth you, heareth me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth me." He who heareth the teaching of Christ, heareth infallible teaching; but Christ, who can not deceive, declares, that he who *heareth his pastors, heareth himself*; therefore their doctrine, being that of Christ, is infallible.

Q. Does not the Apostle—Gal. 1 : 8—assume, that the teaching of the pastors is infallibly correct?

A. Certainly; for he declares, that even an *angel from heaven* is not to be believed, if he teach a doctrine contrary to that preached by the pastors of the Church.

Q. Have we not a most conclusive passage in John 14 : 16, 17, and 16 : 13—"And I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you forever, the Spirit of truth You shall know him, because he shall abide with you and in you; but when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will teach you all truth?"

A. Here the teaching body of the Church are to be directed by the *Spirit of truth*, who is to teach them *all truth, and forever*. They must then be infallible guides.

Q. Does not Christ call his Apostles the light of the world?

A. Yes; and upon these words we argue in the following manner. The light, sent by Christ to enlighten the world, could not lead into darkness or error; but the Apostles and their lawful successors were such light; therefore they could not lead mankind astray.

Q. We admit, say some of our Reformed brethren, that the Apostles were infallible, but we can not make the same admission as to the pastors who succeeded them.

A. You must, we reply, either admit the latter, or you must make Christ a respecter of persons, who gave to the first Christians *infallible* teachers in the Apostles, and left all the rest of mankind to the direction of erring men. Christ surely makes us as *secure* as the first Christians; he loves us as he loved them.

Q. Can you strengthen your cause by a reference to Ephes. chap. 5?

A. Yes. The Church is described there as the spouse of Christ; Christ has sanctified her, and loved her, and presented her to himself, without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, and made her holy and without blemish. Now, this Church must be free from error, otherwise Christ could not sanctify her, nor could he love her, if she was idolatrous: her holiness, without spot or blemish, is a certain pledge of her infallibility. "Obey your prelates," says St. Paul, "for they watch, as being to render an account for your souls." Now, how could the Almighty, by his Apostle, order us to hear and obey men, unless he knew that these men could teach us no error? "Take heed to yourselves," says the same Apostle to the pastors of the Church, "and to your whole flocks, wherein the *Holy Ghost* has placed you

bishops, *to rule* the Church of God." Could the Holy Ghost subject his people in this world to the rule and direction of men, who might—and, according to Protestants, did—teach error, idolatry, and superstition?

Q. Must not the rule of faith, given by the Almighty to mankind, have been an easy rule?

A. Yes; because it was intended for the *ignorant* as well as the *learned*. Wherever the Christian Church existed, there were Christian pastors—for we can not suppose a flock without shepherds; hence, the teaching of these living guides was always within reach of their people. This mode of acquiring instruction is a "path in which even fools can not err;" not so the Bible, about the interpretation of which even the most learned dispute and differ, and which, until the invention of printing, fourteen hundred years after Christ, could not be within the reach of the people at all; and to those who were unable to read, could be no rule at all.

Q. Was the Jewish as well as the Christian Church infallible?

A. As long as it was the decree of heaven that the Jewish Church should exist, she was, by the teaching of her pastors, infallible as a guide to her people. During the first two thousand four hundred years of the world, there was no Scripture; God's people—Seth, Abraham, Isaac, Israel, Job, Melchizedek—were saved by the teaching, which must have been infallible, of the patriarchs. In Deut. 31, the Levites are ordered to read and expound the Scripture to the people; but the Scripture is not put into the hands of the people. In the same Book, chap. 17, all are commanded, under pain of death, to have recourse to the pastors of the Church in every controversy. In 2 Paralip. (2 Chron. 19)—"Amarias, your high priest, shall be CHIEF in the things which regard God." In Malac. 2 : 7, the people are commanded to seek the law from the lips of the priesthood. Now, surely these commands, to obey the pastors or teachers in the Jewish Church, evidently suppose that body to be infallible, for a good God could not command his people, under pain of death, to obey men who might lead them into error.

Q. Was the Church of Christ to be so universal, that all its children might be within reach of its teaching?

A. St. John, Apoc. 7 : 9, besides twelve thousand of every tribe of Israel, saw a great multitude, *which no man could number*, of all nations, tribes, peoples, and tongues. Ps. 2 : 8—"Ask of me, and I will give thee the Gentiles for thy inheritance, and the end of the earth for thy possession." Ps. 22 : 27—"All the ends of the earth shall remember and be converted to the Lord." Ps. 72 : 7—"He shall rule from sea to sea, . . . yea, all the kings of the earth shall adore him, and all nations shall serve him." And in the New Testament, the Church is represented as a city on the top of a mountain—as a light which can not be hid—whilst Christ commissions his Apostles to teach *all nations*. The teaching of the Church, then, is within reach of all, as the Church is visible to all; but no one in his senses will say the same of the Bible, whose existence, in the hands of the people, was an impossibility during most of the time that has elapsed since the establishment of Christianity.

CHAP. II.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Arguments from the New Testament.

Q. Why does the Doctrinal Catechism quote the words, "If he will not hear the Church," etc., in favor of Roman infallibility, though, as we have already seen, (page 38,) this sentence has nothing whatever to do with Church *doctrine*?

A. It can only be because it seems necessary to find something for that notion in Scripture; and as nothing of the kind can be found, they take something which *sounds* like it.

Q. The Doctrinal Catechism says that the Scribes and Pharisees were the infallible teachers of the Old Law, and that the pastors of the Roman Church are their successors in the New Law: how is this?

A. There is certainly *a most striking resemblance* between them, and all will do well not to stop at the first

verse of this chapter, but to *read the whole of it*, in which our Lord seems to have foretold the character of most of the Roman clergy.

Q. But do the words, "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat," etc., show that Christians are to believe all that their pastors teach, however different it seems to them from the Book of God, or however unholy their lives?

A. No : for we are expressly commanded to "beware of false teachers, knowing them by their fruits:" that is, to compare all that is preached with the written Word, and to be most careful where the preachers lead evil lives. The Lord plainly meant, that the people should listen obediently to "the Scribes," etc., "*in all that they require from the books of Moses and the Law of God,*" (as Theophylact, one of the Fathers, says ;*) but not that they must believe every thing these men might teach ; for he had before bid them "*beware of the doctrine of the Pharisees,*"† and said that these "taught for doctrines the commandments of men," "and by their traditions made void the law of God," and were "blind leaders of the blind."‡ Good reader, do those who represent our Lord as saying that these men were "infallible teachers," study the Scriptures with an honest and good heart ? They were, indeed, just as infallible as these, their modern successors.

Q. Are the bishops of the Roman Church infallible because the Apostles in deciding something, said, "It seemed good unto the Holy Ghost," etc. ?

A. No : the men who said this were inspired men who then spoke, and afterward "*wrote* as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

Q. Are the clergy of the Roman Church "infallible," because Christ "gave some Apostles and some prophets," etc. ?

A. Plainly, those words of themselves do not say so. One of the great duties of the Apostles was to write

* In Matt. 23 : 2, 3.

† Matt. 16 : 12 : "Then they understood that he said not that they should beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees."—Douay Bible.

‡ Matt. 15 : 6, 9, 14 : "You have made void the commandment of God for your tradition, teaching doctrines and commandments of men. They are blind and leaders of the blind."—Ib.

the New Testament, which should be for the use of the Church after their days, and should guide their successors in teaching the body of the Church, and should guard it against any errors into which these teachers might fall.

Q. Has the promise that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," failed, if the Church has ever erred in doctrine?

A. No more than it has when the Church has not been *holy* in all its members.

Q. Are these priests and bishops of the Roman Church "infallible" because the Lord sent the Apostles to "teach all nations"?

A. No, for the Apostles were inspired to teach the pure truth, and to have it written in the New Testament for the pastors and teachers after them. They do indeed, to this day, address all nations in the written words of the Gospels, and so, being dead, they yet speak. If any of their successors choose to teach any other religion, the pure religion itself contradicts them in the "infallible" *book of God*.

Q. What do you say to the statement, that "Christ does not tell you that his Church will be infallible only for a time" etc.?

A. He does not say that it will be "infallible" *at all*: that is, in the sense of the Roman Church, that it never can or will teach any false doctrine. The true and immortal Church *has* never failed (with all its corruptions) to be the pillar and ground of the truth in keeping this truth from utterly perishing in the world; and this chiefly by preserving the Holy Book, though to a great extent, and for a long time, itself ignorant of the value of that Book. More than all, it has in these last days (in the glorious Reformation) returned from the ignorance of the Dark Ages, to a wise and pure *preaching* of that truth, and there are signs that this will, before long, triumph through all the world.

Q. Does St. Paul in Gal. 1 : 8, "assume that the teaching of the pastors is infallibly correct," declaring "that even an angel from heaven is not to be believed if he differs from those pastors"?

A. I am amazed at the—(what shall I call it?)—the effrontery of this argument. Here is the passage: "But though *we* or an angel from heaven preach unto

you any other gospel, let him be accursed.”* He himself was certainly one of the pastors; yet he says, “*Though we preach unto you any other gospel,*” etc. This is so far from assuming that the pastors can not preach a false doctrine, that it *does* assume that they *may*, and OF ITSELF overthrows all the cunning arguments these men may make for their infallibility. Yes, these men *may* preach another gospel. And how are we to detect it? By comparing it with that which St. Paul *did* preach, *as we find that in the Holy Scriptures*.

Q. Is our Lord God unjust to us because we do not now have the preaching of the inspired Apostles as the first Christians had?

A. *They* had the spoken words of the Apostles; we their written words in the Scriptures of the New Testament, which, in these days, are even more useful than those could be.

Q. CAN we reasonably think that every Roman priest is as safe a teacher of religion as one of the Apostles would be?

A. I make this appeal now to any one who belongs to that Church. Your priests may have been always very wise and saintly men. But if you know *one* who is ignorant and stupid, if not worldly and low-minded, (and you will not question that there are *some* such :) do you think that he is infallible in his preaching as St. Paul was in his?

Q. Do facts which the Roman Church itself admits, show that the prophecies of Scripture do not mean that the Church can not ever teach false doctrine?

A. Yes; for if it were proved that one of their priests so taught, they would say that it was not the doctrine of that Church. Thus some escape from upholding the persecuting doctrine of (St.) Thomas Aquinas, Bellarmine, Alphonso de Castro, etc., or the blasphemous worship of Mary by (Sts.) Bonaventure and Alphonso de Liguori. Yet we are told, that “‘They’ (the priests) ‘shall teach my people,’ etc.; ‘they shall stand in judgment, and shall judge according to my judgments.’ The

* “But though we or an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you beside that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.”—Douay Bible.

judgments OF THE PRIESTS of the Most High must then be *infallible*, since they are according to the judgment of God himself!" It is no help for those who have been led astray by such teachers, that the Church at large is said not to have fallen into error. If it is necessary for the salvation of all men, that the whole Church should teach only the truth, it is just as necessary for the salvation of *each* man that *his pastor* should not teach false doctrine; and this is just as much foretold in the prophecies. As the Doctrinal Catechism says: "The judgments of the priests of the Most High God must be infallible, since they are according to the judgment of God himself." "But no," you say, "it can not mean that, for some priests—(Luther and Cranmer?)—have erred." Precisely so: in the same way it can not mean that the whole Church is infallible, because in fact it did err in the Dark Ages.

Q. Is the cause of Roman infallibility strengthened by quoting what St. Paul says of the Lord's presenting the Church "without spot," etc.?

A. No: on the contrary, it is utterly demolished by it. For surely that Church is not "without spot," etc., which has produced the blasphemous follies of Dominic and Francis, of Loyola and Liguori; the filthiness of Borgia; the bloody racks and piercing shrieks of the Inquisition, and the dungeons and dens of Naples; and which has made Rome itself the scoff and the stench of the enlightened world. "Her holiness without spot or blemish is a certain pledge of her infallibility"! I should think so.

Q. Which is the *easier* "rule of faith," "for the ignorant as well as the learned"?

A. That of the first Christians, and now of the Reformed Churches, far rather than that of the Dark Ages and the Roman Church. For any honest person can then find the truth by reading in that plain Book of God, or hearing it read in public worship. Whereas by the other I must study a hundred Latin and Greek books to find out what the Councils and Popes have said; with this only other chance, that I must be the blindfold and crawling slave of any low-minded priest.

Q. Was the Jewish Church infallible, and so does this prove that the Christian Church is so also ?

A. We admit that the arguments for both these stand or fall together. Now, we have already seen, that our Lord says, that the lawful teachers of the Jews taught false doctrine, even calling them "blind leaders of the blind." What, then, need be said of this more ? The Jewish Church *did in fact* fall into general false religion and wicked behavior. The temple was closed for years together, and idolatry prevailed in all the land. In this the priests themselves joined, as the Book of God says : "For both prophet and priest are profane ; yea, in my house have I found their wickedness, saith the Lord."* "But the law shall perish from the priest."† This question, then, is settled. The teaching body of the Church, whether Jewish or Christian, never was "infallible."

Q. In what sense, then, were the people to "seek the law at the priests' mouth" under the first Covenant, and are Christians in like manner to hear their pastors as they hear the Lord, in his Church ?

A. Just as they see this teaching to agree with the written Word of God. This makes us reverent and obedient, while it keeps us wise and free.

CHAP. III.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. May not some reasoning Protestant here say : You have given a very plausible interpretation of these passages of Scripture in favor of the infallibility of the Church of Christ ; but how are we to know that yours is the true interpretation—that these texts mean exactly what you say ?

A. Here we have a sensible person to reason with, and we request him to beg the Almighty to enlighten his mind ; we beg him to solicit this grace through the all-powerful mediation of the incarnate and crucified

* Jer. 23 : 2. "For the prophet and the priest are defiled, and in my house I have found their wickedness, saith the Lord."—Douay Bible.

† Ez. 7 : 29. "And the law shall perish from the priest."—Ib.

God ; we beseech him also to recollect, that there is a thick mist of long-fostered prejudice to be removed—that the effects of early education are to be overcome—pride and self-love to be curbed and repressed. Let him give these texts an attentive reconsideration, and then weigh impartially the following reflections.

1st. The following rule of criticism has been universally received : “ Every explanation must be clearer than the thing explained.” The texts, then, in question, by the chapter titles of the Protestant Bible, evidently refer to the Christian Church ; on this head, therefore, there can be no dispute. These texts say, that, in the Christian Church, the *Lord will teach us his ways*—that our path shall be *so plain that even fools can not err in it*—that God will never be *wroth with his Church*—that she shall be *founded in justice*—that her *children shall be taught of the Lord*, etc., etc. Now, what interpretation can be so clear as that which I gave these texts—that the Church of which they were spoken must be free from error ; and what inference could be more forced and unnatural than this, which Protestants draw—that a Church, with these splendid and glorious attributes—a Church which has God as her teacher, his Spirit her guide, and his Word ever in her mouth, should be liable to teach error, or fall into idolatry ?

The inference which I drew from the New Testament evidences is still more natural. *I will build my church upon a rock*—the gates of hell shall not prevail against it—*I will be with her all days, even to the consummation of the world*—*she is the pillar and ground of truth*—*my Holy Spirit will teach her all truth forever*. Is not the interpretation of these passages, in favor of infallibility, easy, natural, and obvious ; and would not any interpretation of them, in favor of fallibility, be forced, conjectural, and whimsical, and much less clear than the texts themselves ?

2dly. Our next reason for the admission of the Catholic interpretation is this : We have, for this interpretation, the unanimous testimony and collective judgment of all ages, of all nations, of all Christian people ; and surely this ought to be preferred to the private in-

terpretation of one fallible man ; for this, in fact, is the Protestant rule—each Protestant is bound to follow the interpretation *he himself* thinks best. If there is wisdom among many counsellors, and if Christ is in the midst of even two or three gathered together in his name, surely any interpretation, universally believed by the Catholic Church spread over all nations, and existing in all ages, is preferable to the interpretation of any one individual, how learned soever he may be !

3dly. Our interpretation should be admitted, if I can prove that the Protestant mode of interpretation ought to be rejected ; truth lies between us ; the one must be right, the other wrong. Now, that mode of interpretation is bad in theory, which its advocates are obliged to abandon in practice. But such is the Protestant mode ; it supports the right of private judgment as the great palladium of Gospel liberty. When, therefore, Protestant Churches interfere with, or restrain this liberty, they abandon their system in practice. But the Church of England excommunicates—the Church of Scotland excommunicates—for doctrinal errors ; is this reconcilable with the right of private judgment ? This right, they say, is from Christ ; those who use it are responsible only to Christ ; and if so, no Protestant Church has a right to judge of its use, or its abuse, for that is the very power they deny to the infallible Church. Protestants authorize each man to interpret, and then excommunicate and depose him for doing what they authorize ; hence, their principle is bad ; they hold in theory what they are obliged to abandon in practice. What, indeed, are their signatures to the thirty-nine articles, and the Athanasian Creed—their denunciations of Dissenters and Unitarians—their suspensions of Pusey and others—but a practical abandonment of the empty boast of Protestantism—the right of private judgment ?

4thly. That mode of interpretation must be the correct one, which is sanctioned by the example of the Apostles, and practised by the primitive Church. But both these appealed, not to *private* judgment, but to the judgment of the teaching Church, for the truth of

their doctrines. When certain teachers at Antioch disputed with Paul and Barnabas concerning the necessity of circumcision, did they appeal each to his private judgment, or to the Scripture privately interpreted? No; they sent a deputation with Paul and Barnabas to consult the pastors of the Church at Jerusalem. The Judeans and Antiochians, led by private judgment, believed circumcision necessary; Paul and Barnabas thought otherwise. They appeal, not to the Bible, but to the teaching body of the Church, and, under the direction of the Holy Ghost, the point is decided by this body. Now, if the Scripture alone were the only rule, the Antiochians were guilty of a heinous sin in abandoning that rule, and the Apostles were equally criminal in deciding by any other.

5thly. That mode of interpretation is true which was adopted during the first five centuries; during which period even Protestants admit that the Church was pure and free from every error. Now, when Arius denied the Divinity of Christ, there was no appeal to private judgment; a general Council was called in the year 325, and thus was condemned, by the body of living teachers, the impious doctrine of Arius—a doctrine which may be styled the first monster produced by the principle of private interpretation.

6thly. Such as the above was the principle adopted by all the Fathers of the first five centuries. St. Irenæus, (Adv. Hæres. l. iv. c. 45,) who lived in the second century, says: "God appointed in his Church Apostles, prophets, and doctors; where, therefore, are the holy gifts of God, *there must the truth be learned.*" And again, Cap. lii. p. 355: "To this man all things will be plain, if he read diligently the Scriptures, *with the aid of those who are the priests in the Church, and in whose hands rests the doctrine of the Apostles.*" Origen, of the third century, says, (Præf. lib. i. Periarchon,) "Many think they believe what Christ taught, and some of these differ from others; . . . all should profess that doctrine which *came down from the Apostles and now continues in the Church; that alone is truth which in nothing differs from what is thus de-*

livered." St. Hilary, in the fourth century, says, the ship from which Christ preached "is an emblem of the Church, within which is the *word of life placed and preached.*" "I would not," says St. Augustine (*Contra Epist. Fund.*) in the fifth century, "I would not give credit to the Gospel, unless the *authority of the Church* induced me to it; for," says he, *Contra Faust.*, "the *authority of our sacred books is confirmed by the consent of nations, through the succession of Apostles, bishops, and councils.*"

CHAP. III.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What is this chapter occupied with?

A. With rules for a Protestant to exercise his *private judgment* upon the Scripture in such a way as to be converted to the Roman Church. For this it quotes and argues only from Scripture.

Q. What has the Doctrinal Catechism just said (p. 455, etc.) of this proving doctrine to each one's judgment by the Scriptures?

A. That it is a "pretended rule"—that "nothing can be more absurd"—that "the Bible, as privately interpreted, is the fruitful source of delusions, heresies, and schisms"—that "by this you will make as many religions as there are different persons"—and that by this "God acts as an unwise legislator who would make every man his own judge in matters of law," etc., etc.

Q. Why then do those who thus denounce all arguing to the private judgment and conscience of men from the Holy Scriptures, now use the same argument with you?

A. Because they *know* that it is the only natural and proper way to reason on the Christian religion; and to convince me at all, they must do this, *or pretend to do it.*

Q. But suppose they say that they are not arguing from the mere words of Scripture, but from that Scripture as they, "the teaching body of the Church," interpret it?

A. The very thing they are to *prove* is that *they* and they alone *are* the true teachers of the Church of God, and that they as such must be right in the meaning

which they give to Scripture. It would be laughable to argue in this way, namely: "We and we alone tell you the true meaning of Scriptures, because the Scriptures themselves say so. Now you may be sure that the Scriptures mean this, *because we tell you so*, and, you know, we and we alone can tell you the true meaning of the Scriptures!"

Q. It seems then that I can no more escape from my private judgment in religion, whatever I may say, than I can from my private choice of doing right or wrong. But why does the Roman Church take such pains to make me think that I can and ought to give up reading and judging the word of God for myself?

A. No doubt some people have been bewildered by these cunning arguments, and honestly reasoned themselves out of reasoning at all; so that the only use they will make of the judgment which God has given them to use on all things, is to decide *not to use it*. But the real reason of the leaders of that Church for this is, that Holy Scripture is so plain and strong against its errors, that the best means of keeping sincere people in their Church is to persuade them not to read the Book of God at all. So they discourage reading of the Bible not because it is so *hard* to be understood, but because it is so *easy*; not because by this reading people are apt to go wrong, but because they are so likely to find that their Church is wrong.

Come now, be candid, you who are loath to agree to this. Which of two parties is most likely to hold the real meaning of a book; those who circulate it freely and eagerly, and even give it away to all who will accept it; who challenge the other party to argue from its very words, and appeal to the judgment of all men which is right? or those who advise all whom they can influence (using fear and force where they can) not to read it, and command them any way to take the divine words only in the sense which *they* allow, and who speak of it as being "a fruitful source of delusion," etc.?

Q. What rule does common-sense give us for understanding what is foretold in the Scriptures of the purity and glory of the Church?

A. The only humble and obedient one, of understanding prophecies according to what has actually taken

place since, and not in violent and outrageous contradiction of *those facts*. Thus when the Lord has said of the Church, "Thou shalt not be put to shame," "They shall walk in my judgments and observe my statutes and do them," "I am with you always"—it is far from doing *honor* to the word of God to say that the natural meaning of this is that all the members and especially all the pastors of the Church have always been holy; that so, for instance, Pope Alexander VI. was a holy man, when WE KNOW he was the bloodiest and filthiest wretch the world ever saw. Therefore it is plain that God plainly and only declares that there should always be some holy living in the Church, and that in the last days on this earth, and still more in the glory of heaven, its holiness should shine with cloudless splendor. Just so *it is not* the "natural meaning" of these words, that the Church never could hold false doctrine, since we know for instance, that in the Dark Ages it decreed, "Images are to be adored," though God's law is, "THOU SHALT NOT MAKE UNTO THEE ANY GRAVEN IMAGE," etc. "No," says some one, "the law of God can not mean that, for the Church has decreed image-worship and the Lord has promised to be always with his Church. Just so: Alexander VI. *was* a holy man, ("HIS HOLINESS!") for is it not written, "Neither shall they defile themselves any more, etc."?—(Ez. 37 : 23,) though he was guilty all his life long of robbery, murder, adultery, and incest.

Q. When and by whom was this foolish reasoning *against* facts, instead of according to them, introduced?

A. In the Dark Ages, and by those called "school-men." They argued in this absurd way about all science; first declaring what *ought* to be true, and then torturing the facts to suit this "theory," as it was called. Thus one of these men once explained his "theory" about something to his friend; and when the other showed him how some *facts* disproved it, he said: "*So much the worse for the facts!*" Just so the Roman Church when its false notions are overthrown by facts, cries out: "SO MUCH THE WORSE FOR THE FACTS!"

Q. What say you to the rules which the Doctrinal Catechism does venture to give you for your "private judgment" of these prophecies?

A. It begins by advising prayer to God for his enlightening grace. This is a good Protestant rule. Then it says: "First, Every explanation must be clearer than the thing explained." Does that enlighten you at all, my reader? Secondly, "The unanimous judgment and collective testimony of all ages, of all nations, of all Christian people," in favor of only believing what the Roman priests tell us! If it had referred us for this to the unanimous babbling of the Dark Ages, it would not have been amiss. But *you have seen for yourself all through this book* whether there is any such unanimous judgment in favor of the Roman doctrine.

Q. What is the substance of its third rule?

A. An assertion that the old and free principle of each man's making up his mind for himself, is bad, because Protestants themselves reject it in practice.

Q. What does it tell us is a proof of this?

A. That the Reformed Churches expel from them any of their members who teach false doctrine.

Q. Does this prove that they reject the freedom of private judgment in practice?

A. It is absurd to say so. God leaves us free to do right or wrong; yet he punishes us for wrong-doing. Then, according to the Doctrinal Catechism, we should say that he gives man freedom in theory, but rejects it in practice! No. Protestant Churches do put the word of God in each man's hands and appeal to his own judgment and conscience, as to what he ought to believe and do. But if he chooses, either to deny its plain meaning, or to break its plain laws, they, (as St. Paul directs,) "after the first and second admonition, reject" him. (This is not the same as cursing, imprisoning, or burning him.)

Q. What is its fourth "rule"?

A. To follow that mode of interpretation which is sanctioned by the example of the Apostles, and practised by the primitive Church? This is what Protest

ants do. As the first Christians decided every thing by the words of God uttered by the Apostles, so do we decide all by the words of God as written by them in the New Testament, while the Roman Church makes all its members the dumb slaves of its priests.

Q. What is its fifth "rule"?

A. To follow "that mode of interpretation which was adopted in the first five centuries." It is false (and even an impudent falsehood) that we Protestants admit that the Church was pure and free from every error during all that time. It was so indeed compared with its ripe corruption in the Dark Ages which followed, and which corruptions the Roman Church continues to this day. But the growth of all these things was slow, beginning very soon after the Apostles and progressing for a thousand years. (See table at p. 444.) An excessive deference to what the pastors decided *had* begun to show itself then. But even this was *not at all* the Roman doctrine of infallibility. Read over again *the very things which the Doctrinal Catechism quotes* from Irenæus, etc., and see if they say that you must not study the Scriptures for yourself; that you must believe every thing which "the teaching body of the Church" decides; that this is "infallible," etc., etc. Why, one of those passages of Irenæus is all we need: "To this man *all things will be plain* if he read *diligently the Scriptures* with the *aid* of those who are priests in the Church, and in whose hands rests the doctrine of the Apostles;" so say we indeed. Inquire of and consult the wisest and holiest men you know. Be modest, candid, and sensible; and get all possible help for your judgment. Yet *read and judge for yourself*. This is also the reasoning of Origen, Hilary, and Augustine. As (St.) Augustine says: "The city of God (that is, the Church) *believes the Holy Scriptures*, both Old and New, which we call canonical, FROM WHICH THE FAITH ITSELF IS CONCEIVED, by which the just man liveth, by which we walk WITHOUT DOUBTFULNESS, so long as we are absent from the Lord; which faith being SAFE AND CERTAIN," etc.* Remember also how this same Augus-

* De Civ. Dei, xix. c. 18, p. 425. E.

tine says that: "God in the Scriptures speaks as a *familiar friend* to the hearts of *learned and unlearned*."*

Q. Did the Christians of the fourth century reject the heresy of Arius only on the authority of the Council of Nice, and not because they confuted it from the Scripture?

A. Nothing can be more false than to say this. For Athanasius, the great man of that Council, says of Arius and his followers: "In vain then do they run about and pretend to demand that *Councils should be held for the sake of the faith*. For THE DIVINE SCRIPTURE IS MORE SUFFICIENT THAN ALL OTHER THINGS."†

CHAP. IV.—DOC. CATECHISM.

Q. Can you confirm all these arguments in favor of infallibility, by an appeal to reason, which is the handmaid of Scripture?

A. Yes; reason tells us, that a fallible Church is unworthy of a good and merciful God. What security can man have from a Church which *may* teach error; his salvation depends upon his faith and morals; and how can he be *certain* what he should believe or practise, if he have no teacher but a fallible Church? Hence, either the Church of Christ must be infallible, or there should be no Church at all; for no man can ever be certain that what a fallible Church teaches is true; he can never, without doubting, believe her doctrines; he can have not even moral certainty of salvation; for though he may believe every thing she teaches, and practise all that she commands, he must still remain in doubt as to the truth of his belief. To have true faith, you must have a teacher that can not err; this you can not have, unless the Church be infallible. It is vain for you to reply, that the Scripture is an infallible teacher; we admit it an infallible teacher, if your interpretation of it be infallibly right; but, until you are satisfied that you have it explained

* Op. ii. 611.

† De Symb. i. 720. (?)

by an infallible interpreter, you must still be in doubt regarding its true meaning ; and hence, though in itself the Bible be infallible, with regard to you it is still a fallible rule.

CHAP. IV.—THE OTHER SIDE.

Q. What of confirming this pretended “infallibility” by reason ?

A. All that may be very cunning, but it can not be *true*, because it is *contrary to the facts*. It is more than false ; it is blasphemous to say that “a fallible Church is unworthy of a good and merciful God,” (though some who say this may not mean the blasphemy.) For the Jewish Church with its blind leaders of the blind was from God. So also *did* our Lord suffer his gospel Church to wander into much error, though never altogether losing the great salvation, and especially keeping it in his plain and free *Book* which is “infallible.”

Q. Is it true of this book that “until you have it explained by an infallible interpreter you must still be in doubt regarding its true meaning” ?

A. Again we repeat what every one who has freely and honestly read that book knows, that in all the chief things of religion it does not need any *interpreter* at all. Can not a book speak as plainly as a man’s voice does ? I have as good a right to say that I can not understand the Doctrinal Catechism without some “infallible interpreter.” Or does that writer think that though *he* can speak clearly, God can not ? With as good reason when a Roman priest preaches doctrine to me, I may declare that in order to have “undoubting faith,” I must have an interpreter of *his* words, and so with *his interpreter*. No : such words of God as these interpret themselves : “Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image,” etc. ; “Thou shalt not bow down to them.” Those who wish to “wrest” them, may call in interpreters if they choose.

CHAP. V.—DOC. CATECHISM.

The Church called Catholic is the true Infallible Church of Christ.

We have already proved, by the most convincing arguments, that the Church of Christ, whatever and wherever she be, is infallible; we have yet to point out what and where that Church is; we now deliberately assert, that this infallible Church of Christ, is that great, ever-enduring, and everywhere-existing Church, which is called Catholic.

Q. How do you prove this assertion?

A. Were we destitute of every other argument, the following would be sufficient. That Church, and that Church only, can be the true Church of Christ, which openly avows and believes its own infallibility; for, having once admitted that Christ's Church is infallible, any Church teaching its own fallibility, teaches that it can not be the Church of Christ; because, even though such Church were actually in itself infallible, by teaching its fallibility, it teaches an error in dogma, and, by this very fact, becomes fallible. But the Catholic Church is the *ONLY* Church upon earth, which avows, believes, and teaches its own infallibility; therefore, the Catholic Church is, beyond all doubt, the true, infallible Church of Christ; and the Protestant Church, by proclaiming her own fallibility, and liability to err, proves to a demonstration, that she has no right to the august title of Christ's Church.

Q. What other proofs have you to advance on this subject?

A. The Scriptural marks of the Church of Christ are to be found only in the Catholic Church; hence, the latter is evidently the Church of Christ. These marks are *Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity, and Apostolicity*.*

*As an apology to the reader for the brevity with which we will state the following argument, we request him to remember, that we have treated these subjects more fully at page 50, in the early part of this work.

The true Church of Christ is, according to Scripture, *One*. There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one fold, of which there can be only one shepherd. She is *Holy*: The spouse of Christ—a purchased people—holy and without blemish. She is *Catholic* or *universal*: The prophet declares, that she will have the nations for her inheritance, and the ends of the earth for her possession; and Christ tells his Apostles to preach the Gospel to *all nations*. She is *Apostolical*: Christ was to be with her *all days*—she was to exist *always*, from the time of the Apostles to the end of the world, that all her doctrines might be traced easily back through every age to the Apostolic times.

The Protestant Church is not *One*. Protestants admit and Protestants deny the Trinity; some of them admit and some of them deny the Divinity of Christ; some admit and some deny the necessity of baptism, the real presence, the existence of free-will, the necessity of good works, the propriety of having bishops as rulers; in short, there is scarcely one point in which they are agreed; upwards of two hundred jarring sects of Protestants made their appearance during the first century of their existence. The Protestant Church, then, is not *One*.

Nor can it be said that she is *Holy*. She has taught that God is the author of sin—that man must sin—that good works are hurtful to salvation. Her founders and leading teachers—Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, Knox—were all stained by immorality; Melancthon says, the whole Elbe would not supply tears enough to weep over their crimes; and Luther adds: “Our people are more disorderly, vicious, and cruel *now* than when they were Papists.” The Protestant Church, therefore, is not *Holy*.

Nor is it true that she is *Catholic*. St. Pacian says, that by the name Catholic, the true Church is distinguished from all heresies. The Protestant Church has never, though she has often attempted it, been able to filch that glorious name from us, or to get herself made known and recognized by that title. If you ask any where, even in the Protestant countries, for the Catho-

lic Church, no one will point to a Protestant Church. Fifteen hundred years of Christianity had elapsed after the death of Christ before she made her appearance, before even her very name was known ; therefore she is not *Catholic* or universal as to time. She never was so diffused throughout the world as that she deserved to be styled the Church of all nations. She is only known in a few countries ; Protestants are only 48,000,000, Catholics are 256,000,000 ; she is not exclusively the Church of any one nation, nay, of any one parish under heaven ; therefore, she is not universal as to place. She is not *Catholic* as to the truth of her doctrine—it is different in almost every different country ; it has been chopped and changed almost every year ; scarcely will you find two Protestants, who, on every point, believe the same principles. It is evident, therefore, that the Protestant Church is not *Catholic*.

To be *Apostolical* she should have a perpetual succession of society, doctrine, orders, and mission from the Apostles. Now she made her first appearance in the world only in the year 1517 ; her society existed no where before that time ; her peculiar doctrines could not exist, for there were none to profess them. As she had no existence, she had no pastors ; hence, she could have neither orders nor mission. Indeed, her pastors can not have orders even at present. There are only two ways of receiving orders and mission, either directly from heaven, or from the lawfully sent and ordained pastors of God's Church upon earth ; but Protestant ministers have not received them in either of these ways. They came fifteen hundred years too late to have any connection with Christ or his Apostles ; and they have never been able to prove that they received either orders or mission from the Catholic Church—the only Church in existence when they made their first appearance. The Protestant Church, therefore, has not the Scriptural marks of truth, Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity, and Apostolicity ; hence, beyond all doubt, she can not be that *infallible Church of Christ*, which we have, by such a flood of overwhelming evidence, proved to exist.

CHAP. VI.—DOC. CATECHISM.

The Catholic Church has all the Scriptural marks of Truth.

She is *One* in her faith. The Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Athanasian Creed, and the Creed of Pope Pius, are every where taught and believed; the same articles of faith, the same principles of morality, every where found in her catechisms; the same rule of faith every where followed; the same sacrifice of the Mass every where offered; the same seven sacraments every where administered; the same great festivals of redemption, and the same Apostolical fast of Lent, every where observed. Such, in short, is her unity in these respects, that the Catholic priest is at home on every altar in the world; and the Catholic laity, whether they wander to the west or to the east, to the north or to the south, can join with ease and fruit in every part of Divine worship, because it is every where essentially the same. She is *One* in her government too: her children spread over all nations, differing from each other in every thing else, in the order of religion are one, united, beautiful body, like an army in battle array; each simple Catholic is subject to his parish priest, each priest to his bishop, and each bishop acknowledges the spiritual supremacy of Peter's lawful successor, to whom Christ said: "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep." The Catholic Church is therefore *One*.

She is *Holy*. She teaches her children to believe all that God has revealed in the Old and New Testaments; to look to Jesus alone for mercy, grace, and salvation; to practise the virtues recommended in the Gospel; to receive the sacraments there instituted: in short, to believe firmly, to hope with confidence, to love with fervor God and every fellow-creature. Her pure doctrines, and heavenly means, and pious exertions, have been crowned in every age with myriads of saints, whose lives have been so incontestably holy, that even

enemies have been compelled to admit their eminent sanctity, and reverence their memory. The Catholic Church, then, is evidently *Holy*.

She is *Universal* too. The name *Catholic* has been ever hers in spite of every enemy. By this title is she known *now* every where, as she was in the days of Pagan or Tertullian. She bears not the name of any man or any country, because she is the Church of *every man* and *every country*. Her doctrine has been taught in every nation; Jerome, Augustine, Leo, and Gregory, taught what we teach. It has been attacked in vain by the ablest heretics and infidels; other doctrines have arisen and died in rapid succession; every thing has been changed, even nations have lost their very names; her doctrine has remained the same amid the general wreck, because the truth of the Lord remaineth forever. That she has been universal as to *time*—that is, that she has existed ever since Christ, without any interruption—even Protestants willingly admit; and there is scarcely a nation under heaven that does not attest her universality as to *place*; every where her altars rise, every where her sacrifice is offered, every where her pastors disseminate the pure word of God. She converted the world from Paganism; the names of her Apostles are embalmed in the recollections of the nations she converted. Ask for the patron saint of every nation in succession, and you will find, that he who carried Christianity thither was a Catholic priest or a Catholic bishop. Where is the nation that is not under the protection of some Catholic saint? Where is the great city that is not adorned with some Catholic cathedral, university, or monastic institution—magnificent even in its ruins? Where is the island that is not hallowed by the name of some Catholic recluse? Where is even the graveyard, whose monuments do not speak out antiquity and universality by the names, the emblems, the doctrines, that adorn the moss-clad stone?

In fine, the Catholic Church is *Apostolical*. Her society we can trace, as a religious body, with congregations, pastors, liturgy, back through every age, until

we arrive at that first blessed society, which was formed as the school of Christ and his Apostles ; her doctrines can be traced to no source but the Apostolic times ; her orders and mission can be traced back through an unbroken succession of bishops and Popes to the time of Christ, who ordained and commissioned the first pastors of his Church. She is therefore *Apostolical* in every sense of the word.

We can come then, dear reader, to only one conclusion on this all-important subject, which we think fully warranted by what we have seen. That conclusion is this : the true Church of Christ, which is infallible, ought, according to Scripture, to be ONE, HOLY, CATHOLIC, and APOSTOLICAL. But the Protestant Church is neither one, nor holy, nor Catholic, nor Apostolical ; therefore, she is not, she can not be, the true, infallible Church of Christ. On the contrary, the Church called Catholic is strictly *One* in her faith, her government, her liturgy ; *Holy* in her head, her doctrines, and her saints ; *Catholic* as to time, place, and doctrine ; *Apostolical* as to her society, doctrine, orders, and mission. Therefore, either she is the true, infallible Church of Christ, or God is a deceiver, the Scripture is not his Word, reason is a fancy, and religion a solemn mockery.

THE OTHER SIDE.

MY GOOD READER: Listen to me now solemnly, and ponder well these last words. Whether you have been brought up and until now believed in either the Roman or Reformed doctrines—if you have followed this argument so far on “both sides,” *it is not possible* but that you have felt that, *to say the least*, it was DOUBTFUL whether our Lord has made the ministers of the Church “infallible” teachers of religion; whether he did not rather give his infallible *book* from which all, both pastors and people, were to learn his truth. But this claim on the part of men to be infallible, if not *certain* and *safe*, is dangerous—*very dangerous*—DREADFULLY DANGEROUS. By it the truth itself will very likely be corrupted and the souls of men destroyed. For if we blindly follow our guides, and *they are blind themselves*, (as the Lord said the Scribes and Pharisees were—*infallible* teachers of the Old Church, according to the Doctrinal Catechism,) where may they not lead us?

Do I not do well then, to warn you against these teachers who claim to be “infallible”? Yet *they* call upon you to give up to them *because* they make this bold and dangerous claim. Which of two men do you most readily trust; him who says that he may not always be exactly right, but who consults a book which all agree *is* right, and invites all others to do the same, to think freely and say what they think; or him who says that *he can not be wrong*, and flatly commands you to give up all *your* judgment to him? Is the modest and candid or the conceited and obstinate one more likely to be right? Which of two ship-captains sailing along a dangerous shore would you trust your life with sooner; him who studied a *perfect chart* of it, on which every reef and rock was shown, and was always ready to show you upon it why he sailed as he

did ; or him who kept this locked up from all others, (if he looked at it much himself, which was doubtful,) who called upon you to trust him without any doubt, and without any reason, but just *because* he said that he could not be wrecked, and all others would be ? Above all, how wild would this man's presumption be, and how perilous to trust him, if *in fact* his ship was leaky, his rigging rotten, and his sailing different from what the *perfect chart* required !

It is just like this to say that "the Catholic (Roman) Church is the only Church upon earth which avows, believes, and teaches its own infallibility ; therefore the Catholic Church is beyond all doubt the true, infallible Church of Christ." "Trust yourself to me without asking for any reasons," says the impudent man, "and not to those modest persons who offer to reason with you ; *because* I am the only one who has the assurance to say that he *can not* make any mistakes." [Besides this, my reader, I can prove to you from the *very words of the Doctrinal Catechism*, that the Roman Church is *not* "the true Church of Christ." Take these words, (p. 511,) "That Church and that Church only can be the true Church of Christ which openly avows and believes its own infallibility." Now *it is certain* that the Roman Church has never been declared infallible by a Pope and General Council. **THIS IS CERTAIN.** Ask any one to tell you what Pope and Council have so declared. Yet whenever those who defend that Church are charged with certain doctrines, they say that it is not accountable for those doctrines because they have never been decreed by a Pope and General Council. Then neither is this infallibility one of its doctrines. *Therefore* the Roman Church is *not* "the true Church of Christ."]

You have just read the words in which the Doctrinal Catechism closes the discussion, the best and strongest terms in which it can argue for its side. It only repeats over the things to which you have already had my answer. Can you doubt which way the truth lies ? Or, *if you doubt*—perhaps with much pain at having your old opinions shaken—*can* you ever again have

a "firm and an undoubting faith" that what the pastors of the Roman Church say must be the truth of God? But I do not wish to leave you doubting. I would not have you merely abandon false doctrine, but wish you to embrace the pure "TRUTH as it is in Jesus." I would have him who is "the light of the world" illuminate your mind and heart; I would have him not only 'take your feet out of the horrible pit and miry clay,' but also 'set them upon a rock of stone.'

To then briefly review these last words of the Doctrinal Catechism, they amount to this: that "the Scriptural marks of the Church of Christ are to be found only in the Roman Church," and that "these marks are Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity and Apostolicity." These are not Scripture words. We have already examined the *very words of God* written in the Holy Scriptures; and you know whether the Roman Church has stood that test. Yet the terms "Unity," etc., are good words to describe what we say in the Creed, "I believe in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church;" and so by them we will compare the Roman and Reformed Churches.

First, UNITY. All true Christians together make up the one people of our Lord Jesus Christ. These are one in spirit, having the same general belief found by all in the Book of God, the same profession of Christ in the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and the same loyal service of him in all their life. Why may they not have this unity without thinking and acting just alike in all other things? The Roman Church however claims to be not merely a *part* or even *the greater part* of this one Church, but *the whole of it*; and declares that no other Christians belong to it at all. It claims this too because it alone has a human monarch, the Pope. Are we less citizens of the one Church because we acknowledge as our only sovereign our King sitting in heaven, and because we believe him when he says, "ONE is your Master, EVEN CHRIST, and *ye are all brethren*"?

Secondly, SANCTITY. It is sad that some good

people should repeat such falsehoods as that "Luther Calvin, Cranmer, and Knox, were all stained by immorality." Not a single history of any good repute can be brought as proof of this; while, for instance, *Erasmus* says of Luther: "*The life of the man is extolled even by those who can not bear his doctrine.*" (See p. 17.) On the other hand we can quote Fleury, Dupin, Baronius, Platina, etc., (all of the Roman Church,) to mention fifty wicked Popes and ten most INFAMOUS ones.

Lastly, compare the different nations under Roman or Protestant influence. England is Protestant, France, Roman; Holland, Protestant, Naples, Roman; the United States, Protestant, Mexico, Roman. Yet the Roman Church is the HOLY Church; it is ALL OF the Holy Church!!

Thirdly, CATHOLICITY or UNIVERSALITY. To say that the Roman Church is THE Catholic Church, is simply claiming that it is the *whole Church*. Of course no Protestant communion is guilty of such arrogance and assurance; we leave it to those who like it. But we are *a part* of this Catholic Church, or we are no Christians at all. The question is then simply this, Do you after this full examination of both sides, believe that the Roman Church is the Catholic, that is, the *whole Church* of Christ? To argue for this by estimates of numbers, were they ever so correct, (as we have already seen they are far from being,) or to talk of "patron saints" or "magnificent ruins," or "moss-clad stones," is childish.

Fourthly, APOSTOLICITY. That Church and those Christians are most Apostolic who follow most closely the doctrines and worship and spirit of the Apostles. Which of these two parties do you think this is, now that you have "both sides" before you? Plainly while the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States seems most Apostolic, the Roman Church seems least so. Were St. Peter to go about Rome now without knowing what had happened there since his day, and to enter the great church named after him, on beholding its images and its ceremonies, he would surely

take it for a heathen temple; while in our worship he would find only what was Christian.

I hope that from this book you have now obtained, not merely a knowledge of how they can and do dispute on both sides of this question, or some good things on *your side*, but *the real truth and common-sense of the matter*. I hope you see clearly the *right side* of this great controversy. Still, if (as may be the case) not entirely convinced either way, a new and great duty begins for you; namely, to choose between these sides that which, *on the whole*, seems nearest right. This you are now about to do before God. If *he sees in your heart that you now do this honestly*, then even if the Day of Judgment shows you that you were mistaken, it will also show that God pities and pardons your honest mistake. But if, *against the real choice of your conscience*, you incline toward your worldly comfort, or friends, or education, or prejudices against those who hold the truth, then you will probably find at that same day that by this YOU LOST YOUR SOUL.

Your case will not be like that of those who never knew better, and are therefore excused for their mistakes. You have now seen "BOTH SIDES," and must, yes *must* choose honestly between them. To assist you in this final decision between the Roman and Reformed Churches, consider these plain questions:

First. Which seems most inclined to prevent your forming a fair judgment between the two?

Secondly. Which agrees least with the natural freedom and equality of men?

Thirdly. Which is least like the general spirit and words of Holy Scripture?

Fourthly. Which has borne least good fruits?

Fifthly. Which deals most in curses against its adversaries?

Sixthly. Which has been most violent and cruel toward them?

Seventhly. Which seems most like the "falling away" foretold in the Scripture?

The one that answers to these questions is the corrupt Church against which God has written his terrible

sentence in the Revelation of St. John, calling upon all devout persons who may by any means be now in it : "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues ; for her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities."

But have you by God's goodness been brought up in the pure and free knowledge of God in Christ ? Then can *an honest wish to know the truth and to please God* ever give you a craving after heathenish and slavish superstitions ? And oh ! do not be satisfied with rejecting these and arguing well against them, unless you are a true *Christian* by "calling Jesus Lord" in *your heart*. Listen to what this our most mighty and gracious Lord and Saviour says : "Every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man who built his house upon the sand. And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell, and great was the fall of it." Come, kneel down now in private and let this prayer from your lips enter into the gracious ears of Him who hears all prayers :

O Lord Jesus Christ, Saviour and Teacher and Pastor of every repenting and believing man. I give thee humble thanks that thou hast in this book shown me the light of thy truth on a great matter that much concerns my soul's salvation and thy holy kingdom. And now I pray, so guide me by the Holy Ghost that I may join myself to thee in soul, and make me so profess this, that I may be both outwardly and inwardly a member of thy holy body the true Church ; that I may love and serve thee now, and finally "be numbered with thy saints in glory everlasting."





PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

H&SS
A
5964

